
Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites

Author(s): Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Source: *Orientalia*, 1980, NOVA SERIES, Vol. 49, No. 4 (1980), pp. 283-332

Published by: GBPress- Gregorian Biblical Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/43074960>

REFERENCES

~~Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:~~

~~http://www.jstor.com/stable/43074960?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents~~

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
Orientalia

JSTOR

COMMENTATIONES

Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: The Hittites*

Harry A. HOFFNER, Jr.

Part A

1.1 This investigation focusses upon the Hittites. It should therefore be clearly stated how this term is to be understood¹. We choose to restrict it here to the immediate² subjects of that sequence of kings beginning with Anitta of Kuššar (reigned c. 1750 B.C.) and concluding with Šuppiluliuma II (reigned c. 1200 B.C.). We thus exclude from consideration the subjects of the Neo-Hittite kingdoms of Syria from the twelfth through the eighth centuries B.C.

1.2 The documentary evidence which we shall take into account derives principally from the remains of the ancient city of Hattuša, which at the end of the 1973 season had yielded nearly 27,000 inscribed clay tablets or fragments thereof³. Tablets from other sites include a few from Egypt (El Amarna)⁴ and Alalakh⁵, and a larger number from Ugarit⁶. The majority of these documents exist in versions composed in the Hittite language. But some were originally drafted in Hittite and then translated into Akkadian, the diplomatic lingua franca of the day. One important text, the Hittite version of the treaty between Hattušili III of Hatti and Ramesses II of Egypt, was composed in Hittite, drafted in Akkadian, transported to Egypt, translated into Egyptian, and inscribed in hieroglyphs on the walls of the temple of the god Amon at Karnak and

* See *Or* 49 (1980) 137.

¹ See H. G. Güterbock, "Toward a Definition of the term 'Hittite'", *Oriens* 10 (1959) 233ff.

² That is, not to the indirect subjects, citizens of vassal states.

³ As of 1953 H. Otten estimated 15,000 (*MDOG* 85 [1953] 28). From 1953 through 1973 approximately 12,000 fragments have been assigned inventory numbers.

⁴ The so-called "Arzawa letters", numbers 31 and 32 in the published corpus of El Amarna letters.

⁵ D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (1953) 116ff.

⁶ Published in J. Nougayrol, *PRU* III (1955), *PRU* IV (1956), and *Ugaritica* V (1968).

of the Ramesseum⁷. The other version, which represents the Egyptian point of view, was translated from the original Egyptian language version into Akkadian and transported to the Hittite capital, where it was found in several copies by Hugo Winckler in 1905/06⁸.

1.3 One fourth of the total of 833 entries in E. Laroche's *Catalogue des textes hittites* (*1971) is historical in nature, but this proportion is somewhat misleading, since the number of component tablets and duplicates in a historical composition is much smaller than in other genres such as rituals and festivals. Probably far less than a tenth of the total number of recovered tablets contain historical narrative. The literary effort of the scribes was clearly expended principally on texts other than what we would call "historical".

1.4 In this connection, however, one must keep in mind that historical narrative is found in texts not classified by Laroche under "textes historiques" (nos. 1-220). As in the treaties, so also in the instructions one occasionally finds admonitory stories, such as the Zuliya incident told in *CTH* 265. The so-called "Gerichtsprotokolle" (records of testimony given in trials) contain many examples of personal histories of important as well as minor civil servants⁹. The royal prayers often offer lengthy sections of historical review. For this reason the royal prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal is a not-insignificant historical source for the century preceding Šuppiluliuma I. No one can properly reconstruct the historical events of the reigns of Šuppiluliuma, if he ignores the historical retrospect found in Muršili II's plague prayers. Muršili II's personal life is brilliantly illuminated by his royal prayers which relate the troubles he experienced with his father's last wife (*CTH* 70 and 71, classified in *CTH* under "textes historiques", although in form they are clearly royal prayers), and by the historical introduction to the ritual designed to heal the king from hysterical aphasia (*CTH* 486). Some of the texts which record oracular inquiry (*CTH* 561ff.) deal with historical matters, although they are clearly not narrative.

1.5 In each literate society of the ancient Near East those historical texts which focussed upon the activities of the king tended to devote most of their attention to certain preferred occupations: war-making, hunting, worshipping, presiding at festivals, or the commissioning of building projects. We shall seek to determine the range of royal activities which

⁷ J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (*1969) 199ff. with bibliography.

⁸ Ibid. 201ff. (translation by A. Goetze).

⁹ Virtually all examples of such texts edited by R. Werner, *StBoT* 4 (1967).

the Hittite historiographers saw fit to include in their literary record (cf. [3.8f.] [4.1-3], [5.1], [6.2], [12.3], [12.6-7]).

1.6 The pictorial record of the king's activities (i.e., monumental art) supplements the written record¹⁰. It seems that in the pictorial presentation the emphasis is slightly different from that in the literary. In the literary record we see the king making war, worshiping, presiding at festivals, adjudicating, and making proclamations. On rock reliefs and on seal impressions the king is occasionally shown in battle dress, albeit not in the act of striking a foe (cf. for example Tudhaliya on the rock relief in Kemal Paşa). More often he is depicted in the dress and pose of worship, standing before an altar (Hattušili III at Fraktın, Muwatalli at Sirkeli, unnamed king on relief from city walls of Hüyük in Alaça), or standing upon two deified mountains (Tudhaliya on wall relief at Yazılıkaya), or standing in the embrace of his patron deity (Muwatalli on his seal, Tudhaliya IV on his seal and at Yazılıkaya). Never in the pictorial record is the king shown as judge, either issuing the law or enforcing it.

1.7 The documentation informs us that written records were kept by the Hittites both on clay tablets and on wax-covered wooden tablets¹¹. It appears that there existed a degree of occupational specialization such that one who was a scribe of the wood tablets would not normally also be a scribe of the clay tablets. The existence of the wood-tablet literature, unfortunately lost to us insofar as it was not subsequently transferred to clay tablets, raises the question of the function of these tablets. What kind of material would be recorded by the wood-tablet scribes, as opposed to the clay-tablet scribes? Does the answer to the preceding question inform us what kind of records in the estimation of the Hittites were more important for preservation than others? Was raw data for subsequent historiographic usage originally inscribed on the wood tablets?

1.8 Of course, many questions about the hieroglyphic wood-tablet texts cannot now be answered. I give here but the briefest of summaries of what is known. From the texts, in which such tablets are known by the syllabically written *gulzat(t)ar* (ablat. *gulzat(t)anaz*), the Sumero-gram *GIŠ.ĜUR^(TE)* (complement implies Akkad. *uṣurtu*) and Akkadogram *GIŠLI-U₆*, it is reasonably clear that they served as the ordinary records for ever-changing statistics (inventories of items in stock in the royal magazines, etc.). But in addition they were used, and especially in Kizzu-

¹⁰ See E. Akurgal, *The Art of the Hittites* (New York, no date); K. Bittel, *Die Hethiter: die Kunst Anatoliens vom Ende des 3. bis zum Anfang des 1. Jahrtausends vor Christus* (München 1976).

¹¹ See H. Otten, "Bibliotheken im Alten Orient", *Das Altertum* 1 (1955) 79ff.

watna, to record the traditional rites accorded to the gods in festivals and rituals. There are a few passages which might indicate also that these were used to record sales. But to date I know of no evidence that they were employed to record historical narrative.

1.9 Rarely the Hittites wrote on stone. The longest Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from the Empire Period is the Nişantaş inscription of Šuppiluliyama II¹³. Because of its badly weathered condition this inscription is intelligible only in its opening words, which identify its royal author. Formerly it was ascribed to Šuppiluliuma I¹³ and dated almost two centuries earlier. Now it must be regarded as one of the very latest inscriptions which fall within the chronological limits of our definition of Hittites (i.e., c. 1200 B.C.)¹⁴. Güterbock has pointed out that KBo XII 38 i 1 through ii 10 contain a Hittite version on a clay tablet of a hieroglyphic Luwian inscription on a statue of Tudhaliya IV, which his successor Šuppiluliyama made and had inscribed for his Everlasting Peak¹⁵. Since Šuppiluliuma's inscription recorded his predecessor's "manly deeds" and is clearly historical, it furnishes us with the only clear example of a historical inscription on stone in hieroglyphic Luwian during the empire period. Güterbock also suggested that the continuation of KBo XII 38 (ii 22ff.), contains a translation of another hieroglyphic Luwian inscription of Šuppiluliyama which is comparable to the Nişantaş inscription and which deals with a building on a mountain peak comparable to Nişantepe. The second hieroglyphic inscription, translated in KBo XII 38 ii 22ff., was also dealing with historical matters, principally a Hittite invasion of the island of Cyprus. Thus both examples would prove that, at least toward the end of the Empire Period Hittite kings wrote historical inscriptions on stone in hieroglyphs. See also [17.9] and [17.10].

1.10 Certain texts of the utmost historical import (state treaties) were conserved in the magazine rooms of the Great Temple of the Storm God in the Lower City¹⁶. From the wording of the texts themselves we learn that their place of conservation was chosen to allow the deity to exercise close supervision over them¹⁷. But other texts which were not treaties were recovered by the excavators in the Great Temple. By what

¹³ K. Bittel and H. G. Güterbock, *Boğazköy* (1935) plate 25; see H. Bosser, *Afo* 9 (1935) 172ff.

¹³ So A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 146, note 46.

¹⁴ H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 81 with note 18; H. Otten, *Die hethitischen historischen Quellen* (1968) 7; H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 29 (1970) 74.

¹⁵ *JNES* 26 (1967) 81.

¹⁶ The selection of texts numbered 35 through 97 in *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (henceforth KBo) XIX, all from the Big Temple, will serve to illustrate this point.

¹⁷ V. Korošec, *Hethitische Staatsverträge* (1931) 100ff.

criterion was it decided to store them there? Could the find spot of each tablet or fragment be important, not only for seeking to reconstruct individual tablets from fragments or series from individual tablets, but also in order to understand how the Hittite scribes regarded the content of these tablets? See [17.8].

1.11 Unfortunately it is not always possible to determine the find spot of a given tablet or fragment. Not only were some fragments and whole tablets unearthed by peasants or visitors to the mound and sold on the antiquities market, but even those tablets excavated by the German team during the years of Hugo Winckler's directorship often cannot be attributed to a find spot, because Winckler's records were inadequate. Whenever a fragment which was found in the years of the Bittel directorship (and whose find spots are clearly preserved) can be joined to tablets unearthed during the Winckler years, it is possible to determine the provenience of the entire piece. But this is unfortunately not a frequent occurrence. It is not therefore possible for the present to assign all known written records (and for the present inquiry most important, the historical texts) to their proper find spots. Some help in reconstructing the original locations of the tablets can be found in the Hittite scribes' equivalent of the modern library shelf list, what some Hittitologists call the "catalogues". E. Laroche has devoted forty pages in the second edition of his *Catalogue des textes hittites*¹⁸ to the study of the remains of these ancient shelf lists. But at present even they are insufficient aids to a successful reconstruction.

1.12 Furthermore the task is not completed, when one succeeds in identifying a fragment's find spot. One must ascertain whether this locus was itself a primary one (i.e., a library or archive) or a secondary one (a trash heap, where tablets of no further value were discarded; a spot where valueless tablets were used as simple fill). The temple magazine rooms were clearly not places for discarded tablets. But just exactly what was the status of buildings A and K on the Acropolis? Or of the House on the Slope? Were they libraries, archives, scribal schools? Or were they something else?

1.13 Finally before we begin the consideration of individual compositions (Part B) and what has been concluded about them in previous studies of our subject (Part C), we should consider the observations of Mario Liverani in his article "Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts"¹⁹. Liverani draws the analogy between a living human

¹⁸ (Abbreviated: CTH) pp. 153-193 (chapter XIV).

¹⁹ In G. Buccellati (editor), *Approaches to the Study of the Ancient Near East* (1973, = *Or* 42; fasc. 1-2) 178-194.

informant and a non-living documentary one. The former is subject to cross-examination; the latter is not. Thus, while the former can be a source for the knowledge of other subjects outside himself, the latter cannot properly be such. In the past, so observes Liverani, historians have utilized ancient documents as sources for the knowledge of what the documents say, e.g., historical events, personages, civilizations or societies described. This procedure entails two serious difficulties: "(1) if the textual information is wrong (or in particular internally contradictory), the error passes inevitably into the historical reconstruction; and (2) the type of information in the texts does not always satisfy the needs of the scholar, who has different scopes and interests from the ones of the writers of the documents, and who would like to obtain certain information for which the texts, to his dismay, are uncommunicative or altogether silent"²⁰. Thus Liverani recommends viewing the document as "*a source for the knowledge of itself* — i.e., as a source of knowledge on the author of the document, whom we know from the document itself" (italics his). Thus, while we have a legitimate interest in reconstructing Hittite history, we must recognize that our individual sources are in fact only the best evidence for their own understandings of the order and meaning of past events. As such they may give us a highly distorted view of the events themselves. The consolation is that for our immediate concerns, namely the Hittites' own conception of their past, those same documents furnish us with the best kind of evidence we could desire. An analogy may be found in the visual arts. In the absence of a photograph one may study a painting or a sculpture in order to obtain an impression of the visual appearance of an object. But if either the object itself or a photograph is available for view, it is even more interesting to study the work of art alongside the photographic image in order to learn *how the artist saw* the object. This is precisely what we should like to be able to do with Hittite historical texts. Only — to retain the analogy — we have no photographs to tell us about the exact nature of the events described. We have only the artist's impressions. Equally distressing is the fact that we possess only a portion of the ancient historiographic endeavors which were undertaken during the some five centuries of our period. What we may learn, therefore, is not a single uniform "view" of history writing held by the Hittites, but many individual viewpoints held by some of the Hittites who undertook to write down portions of their past as they conceived it.

²⁰ Ibid. 179.

Part B: Historical Documents

2.0 Hittitologists are fortunate in having a convenient catalogue of historical and historiographic texts comprising entries 1 through 216 of E. Laroche's *Catalogue des textes hittites* (abbrev. *CTH*)²¹. The *CTH* includes not only the grouping of all published and some unpublished text witnesses under individually numbered entries entitled as to their author and subject-matter but also an abbreviated bibliography of editions or important studies of the texts in question. The *CTH* usually does not indicate the find spot of the tablets nor the ductus (i.e., whether or not it is in Old Hittite writing or is a late copy), but it usually does indicate whether or not the language of the text is Old Hittite. And since the texts whose period of composition is the earliest are grouped by Laroche at the beginning (entries 1-39), it is possible for our discussion of the most important of these texts to follow his sequence.

2.1 We will not give separate consideration here to Babylonian quasi-historiographic literary works such as the Sargon and Naram-Sin legends, which are extant in Hittite translations, except when discussing their influence upon native historical literature. For clearly foreign literature in translation is not primary evidence for the native art, although some degrees of Hittite adaptation of the Babylonian originals must be allowed. In fact we exercise embarrassingly little control over the degree of adaptation in these cases, since we possess only a small portion of the Babylonian version of the Sargon "King of Battle" text (exemplar from El Amarna)²², and somewhat more of the Naram-Sin materials (the most complete exemplar is Neo-Assyrian²³, but there are fragments of an Old Babylonian exemplar re-copied at Hattuša)²⁴.

2.2 Composed during the Old Kingdom and preserved in at least one copy showing the old ductus (KBo XXII 2) is a text which its editor H. Otten has styled "Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa"²⁵. The copy in the old writing (KBo XXII 2 = Bo 70/10) was recovered from soundings west of the great temple of the Storm God in the Lower City during the 1970 season. Portions of the text were already known from KBo III 38, which had been transliterated by E. Forrer in 2 BoTU 13. The more recently recovered tablet fragment, however, allowed a recon-

²¹ See my review of this book in *JCS* 24 (1972) 183-187.

²² EA 359. See E. Weidner, *Bogh.-Stud.*, Heft 6 (1922), and H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 43 (1934) 86-91.

²³ From Sultantepe: see O. R. Gurney, *Anatolian Studies* 5 (1955) 93ff. and H. A. Hoffner, *JCS* 23 (1970) 17ff.

²⁴ KBo XIX 98 and 99, not edited to date.

²⁵ StBoT 17 (1973).

struction of the highly important beginning of the narrative. Of great interest is the fact that the text commences with a narrative containing much legendary or mythological material, which is not without parallel in the quasi-historical writings of the Old Kingdom. The narrative relates how once a queen of the city of Kanesh (= Neša = modern site of Kül-tepe) ²⁶ bore thirty sons in the course of a single year. She refers to her offspring as a "gang" (*walkuwan*), a term likewise used disparagingly of an invading horde of Hurrian troops in the Old Hittite text KBo III 40 (= BoTU 14a) obv 15 ²⁷. Deciding to rid herself of this unwanted brood, the queen has baskets caulked with dung, sets the children therein, and puts them into the Halys River (= Kızıl Irmak) to float downstream to the (Black) Sea. Bordering on the river not far from its opening on to the Black Sea was the land of Zalpa/Zalpuwa (the two spellings are used interchangeably in this text). There the gods (in what form we are not told) rescue the infants from the river and raise them to manhood. Meanwhile the Queen of Kanesh has borne thirty daughters, again in one year. But these she has decided to keep. When the boys have grown up, they set out in the direction of Kanesh/Nesha. At a stop-over in Tamarmara they learn of the thirty daughters of the Queen of Nesha and conclude that she may be their own mother. They continue to Nesha, but when they arrive, the gods cause their mother not to recognize them. She offers to them her thirty daughters in marriage. The older brothers do not detect that these are their sisters, but the youngest boy does, and warns his siblings against incest ²⁸. Here the tablet becomes illegible and we lose the train of the narrative for awhile. When the story resumes, it quickly progresses from legendary pre-history to the period of Labarna, Hattušili and Muršili.

2.3 H. Otten assumes that in the lost middle portion of the story the brother-sister marriages took place, and that the Hittite historian used this tale of incest committed by the early citizens of Zalpuwa to lay a basis for the subsequent destruction of the city during the reign of Hattušili I. Another Hittite historian used a different basis (cf. [5.4]). It has also been suggested that the river voyage of the thirty sons from Nesha to Zalpuwa reflects the old historical tradition of the settlement of Zal-

²⁶ H. G. Güterbock, *Eretz-Israel* 5 (1958) 46*-50*, and H. Otten, *StBoT* 17 (1973) 57.

²⁷ The Hittite word *walkuwan* is derived from a shorter stem **walgu-*, and is probably from a proto-IE **wolgu-*. Cognate is Latin *volgus* (masc. and neut.) "multitude, people".

²⁸ On the attitude toward incest among the Hittites see H. A. Hoffner, *Orient and Occident: Essays Presented to C. H. Gordon* (AOAT 22 [1973] 81-90). Note also R. Haase, *WO* 9 (1977) 72-76.

puwa by colonists from Nesha. Such a legendary tale is, of course, a fruitful field for speculations, and it is impossible at present to discount any of them.

2.4 Of central importance is the indisputable fact that the author has used a semi-legendary account to introduce and explain the non-legendary historical narrative which followed. In essence this format is the same as we find in later historiography (Telepinu Proclamation, historical prologues to the state vassal treaties; cf. [5.0], [9.2]). What distinguishes it from historiographic works of the latter half of the 16th century and later is the legendary cast of the prologue narrative, which it shares with other historiographic works attributable to the first Hittite kings (c. 1650-1550).

2.5 Also shared with the Old Hittite "Palace Chronicle", which dates from the reign of Muršili I, is the manner in which in the Zalpa text the successive Hittite kings are designated. In the Zalpa text three consecutive generations of anonymous Hittite kings having dealings in Zalpa are referred to as "grandfather of the king", "father of the king", and "the king"²⁹ (cf. [6.1]). It is thought that the "grandfather" is the immediate predecessor of Hattušili I, whom we elsewhere know only by the dynastic title Labarna³⁰. The "father" would be Hattušili I himself, and "the king" Muršili I. In the Palace Chronicle the "father of the king" is Hattušili and "the king" is Muršili. Therefore both texts were composed during the reign of Muršili I (c. 1620-1595).

2.6 The historical inscription of Anitta, son of Pithana, king of Kuššar, was first edited in transliteration by E. Forrer in 1922³¹. Since then its three exemplars have been published in cuneiform copies, and it has been translated and studied many times. Both Anitta and his father Pithana are mentioned in documents from the Old Assyrian trading colony at Kül-tepe. It is thought that Anitta's rule coincided with the period represented by kārūm Kaniš I b, which is contemporary with the reigns of Šamši-Adad I and Išme-Dagan of Assyria (middle chronology, c. 1814-1742) — first half of the 18th century. The Hittite composition which concerns Anitta was long believed to be a late copy from the 13th century. In 1951 Otten showed that the orthography and grammar of the text were Old Hittite³², and in the 1960s and 1970s it has become clear that the sign forms of copy A are typical Old Hittite (reign of Hattušili I or Muršili I).

²⁹ H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 44 (1938) 101-104; H. Otten, *StBoT* 17 (1973) 8-9, 62.

³⁰ S. R. Bin-Nun, *RHA* 30 (1972) 54-80.

³¹ *Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift* (= WVDOG 41 and 42; Berlin 1922 and 1926).

³² *MDOG* 83, 39ff.

Since Pithana and Anitta, though clearly Anatolian natives and not Assyrians, were never mentioned as ancestors by the Old Hittite kings, it was assumed that they were not Hittites. The text, it was supposed, must have been composed in another language and was subsequently translated into Hittite. The prime candidate for this other language was Hattic, the language of many of the non-Hittite Anatolian rulers of the period. In 1974 E. Neu produced a new edition of the text, utilizing the latest insights into the Old Hittite language. Neu pointed out that translations into Hittite from Hattic are always marked by a certain awkwardness (*Holprigkeit*), which betrays them as translations. The Anitta text, on the other hand, shows none of this translational syntax, but appears to be a fresh composition in Old Hittite³³. If Neu is right, there is no cogent reason to exclude this text from the corpus of Hittite historical texts. What remains to be investigated is whether in its historiographic characteristics it resembles other known Hittite examples from the Old Kingdom³⁴.

2.7 A. Goetze long ago pointed out that the royal activities described in the Anitta text, in particular the building activities and the royal hunt, are somewhat atypical (cf. [17.12])³⁵. The inclusion of events from the reign of the author's immediate predecessor (§§ 1-2) fits well into the practice of retrospect in Hittite historiography. The use of curses pronounced on those who would resettle a sacked enemy city (§ 6, § 12), or on one who alters the king's inscription (§ 9) cannot be documented in the same form in Hittite historical texts. But while we cannot cite curse wording for abandoned cities, we can show that in the annals of Hattušili I (§ 6) the King sowed the ruins of the city of Ullama with *zahheli*-weeds, just as Anitta did to Hattuša (Anitta text, § 11). The curse upon him who changes (Hittite *hulli*-/*hulla*- seems to be a near synonym of *wahnu*- "change, alter")³⁶ the wording of Anitta's inscription can be paralleled from historical fragments and treaties, both in general³⁷ and in the specific wording with the verb *hulli*-/*hulla*-³⁸. Neu pointed out that Anitta's subjects in Kanesh/Neša, for whom the gate inscription was prepared, would have

³³ E. Neu, StBoT 18 (1974) 132ff.

³⁴ A modest beginning was made by Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951) 39, 44, and A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 148. See also H. Cancik, *Mythische und historische Wahrheit* (1970) 47-48.

³⁵ *Kleinasien* (²1957) 92.

³⁶ For Hitt. *hulla*/i- I favor the basic meaning "turn, reverse, change". The verb describes turning back, repulsing or defeating an enemy, contesting or changing an agreement (Hittite law no. 29), and changing or altering the wording of a text.

³⁷ Examples cited by E. Neu, StBoT 18, 76.

³⁸ *kuišat hullizz[i tuppiyaš]* INIM.MEŠ *naš ANA* DINGIR.MEŠ LÚ.KÚR-ŠUNU *eš[du] nan parhiškandu* "Whoever alters them, the words [of the tablet], let him be an enemy of the gods!" KUB XI, 54 rev. 2-5; compare IBoT III 131:5.

spoken Nesite (= Hittite), so that there is no linguistic or historical reason to doubt that the text was originally composed in Hittite.

2.8 The manner of designating years in the Anitta text is quite different from Hittite annals. In Anitta the word "year" occurs twice: in § 3 in the expression "after my father Pithana (died), in the same year" (*šaniya witti*); and in § 17 in the expression "in the following year" (*wettan-dannieššima*). The latter might be compared with MU.IM.MA-*annima* of the annals of Hattušili I and the MU(.KAM)-*annima* of the annals of Muršili II, but the correspondence is incomplete (cf. [3.4]).

2.9 Otten (1951) and Cancik (1976)³⁹ have claimed that the Anitta text was organized around the theme of the rise of the dynasty of Kuššar. Cancik admits⁴⁰ that this theme is only implicit in the text and must be deduced. But if, as he earlier states, works organized about a theme must be integrated by every literary means at the disposal of the author, why do we see so little evidence of the employment of literary devices to subordinate each component of the inscription to the single theme?

2.10 Certainly Old Hittite possessed sufficient syntactic means to order the presentation in the same degree that Cancik has shown was done by Muršili II. Was this in fact even attempted in the Anitta text? To a limited degree it was. Historical retrospect was supplied in the course of the narrative by using the adverbs *karu* ... [*app*]ezziyana ... "previously ... but later ..." (lines 39-42, § 11)⁴¹. But there is no trace of the techniques developed later for portraying simultaneous action in different locations, or for showing contemplated strategy which was never actually carried out through the use of the grammatical irrealis mode. Indeed it appears that the employment of the linguistic and literary devices for purposes of historiographic technique which Cancik has demonstrated for Muršili II and later was not developed until after the Old Kingdom. And, given the capacities of Old Hittite syntax for subtle distinctions, it is unlikely that this undeveloped historiographic style may be attributed to linguistic inadequacy. Rather the historiographic technique required centuries of practice before it could become the articulated science which flourished under Muršili.

3.0 After the Anitta text the oldest Hittite text in annalistic style (cf. [18.1], I) is the text known as "the manly deeds of Hattušili"⁴². The

³⁹ H. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951) 44, cited by H. Cancik, *Grundzüge der he-thitischen und alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (1976) 36, 81, note 110.

⁴⁰ *Grundzüge* 36.

⁴¹ Use in the Muršili annals is discussed by H. Cancik, *Grundzüge* 21f.

⁴² H. Otten, *MDOG* 91 (1958) 73ff.; A. Goetze, *JCS* 16 (1962) 24ff.; H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 18 (1964) 1ff.; edition by F. Imparati and Cl. Saporetti, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 14 (1965) 40-85.

principal exemplars of this text ⁴³ were found in 1957 in the remains of Building K on the acropolis. Although, like several other historical works of the Old Kingdom (cf. [5.0], [9.0]) this composition was passed on in both Akkadian and Hittite versions, its two versions are not contained on the same tablet in parallel columns, as one finds in the Political Testament of Hattušili (cf. [5.0]).

3.1 No known copy of Hattušili's annals in the old handwriting has been found. One cannot prove therefore whether or not both versions existed already in the Old Kingdom.

3.2 Priority has been claimed for the Akkadian version by Otten and Kammenhuber, and for the Hittite by Goetze ⁴⁴. Whereas parts of at least four exemplars of the Hittite version exist, only one copy of the Akkadian has been identified. This might suggest that, while the Hittite version had a long history of transmission, the Akkadian translation was recently made and never re-copied. But even the Akkadian version shows signs of copyist errors, which proves that it too had a history of transmission, even if a shorter one. And since Akkadian was not the native language in Hatti, one expects more copies in Hittite.

3.3 In their present copies both versions are characterized by grammar and vocabulary which appear in Akkadian and Hittite texts composed in the late (Empire) period. But it should be noted that both contain linguistic features which can only be regarded as survivals from Old Hittite prototypes ⁴⁵. It is therefore probably the wisest course to give up any attempt to show absolute priority of either version. Even if the text was first drawn up in Akkadian, unless the composer was a native speaker of that language, it was thought out in Hittite and translated mentally into Akkadian. The text is clearly a Hittite composition in the fundamental sense.

3.4 Of what does the Hittite annalistic style consist? The developed style of Muršili II will be considered later under [12.0] and following. The embryonic style evident already in the Hattušili I text (c. 1650) may be described as follows.

H. Cancik ^{46a} has classified the text as a "Tatenbericht". He notes that it lacks causal clauses, hypothetical and concessive constructions ^{46b}, which characterize the historical compositions of Muršili II and his successors. Nevertheless he believes that it does contain many elements

⁴³ H. Otten, *MDOG* 91 (1958) 73ff.

⁴⁴ Otten, *ibid.*; Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 154 note 101; Goetze, *JCS* 16 (1962) 24f.

⁴⁵ H. C. Melchert, *JNES* 37 (1978) 1-22.

^{46a} H. Cancik, *Mythische und historische Wahrheit* 49f.

^{46b} But the irrealis is employed in Hattušili's Political Testament: §§ 16, 17 and 21; cf. [5.1-3], [16.25].

of the later historiography in germ form: political and historical excurses in which the author seeks to defend his claim to be the first king to cross the Euphrates River ^{46c}, and the scheme of military action in which the opponent is not just a passive object of the king's action, but an equal participant with his own initiative. The deeds of the king are organized according to the king's regnal years, of which only the first five are included on this tablet. Because the colophon is broken where the notation "complete" or "incomplete" once stood, we do not know if originally there was a second tablet containing events from later years. To be sure, the years are not actually numbered in the text. No new section commences with the words "in my ...-th year". But then neither is this practice attested for the much more developed annals texts of Muršili II. The introductory formula for each new year in the Hittite version is MU.IM.MA-an-ni-ma, "in the following year" ⁴⁷. In his Ten-Year Annals Muršili II (c. 1330) employs MU-an-ni-ma and MU.KAM-an-ni-ma regularly to mark the transition to the narration of a new year's events. In the Detailed Annals of Muršili II, on the other hand, the formula is quite different: *maḥḥan-ma ḥamešḥanza kišat* "but when it became spring, ..." ⁴⁸.

3.5 The narration of the king's exploits is carried out in the first person in the Hittite version, the same usage as is observed in the later annals of Tudhaliya, Arnuwanda, Muršili II and Hattušili III, as well as by the earlier Anitta text, the Ammuna text, and the Telepinu Proclamation. In contrast to this the Akkadian version is phrased in the third person, as is the Siege of Uršu text [4.0] composed in Akkadian.

3.6 Within the framework of the regnal years the narrative assumes the form of a military itinerary, including in proper sequence the foreign cities and lands visited by the king and his army during each year. "I went on to the city of Zalpa and sacked it... The next year [I] went to the city of Alalḥa and sacked it. Afterwards I went to the city of Waršuwa (= Uršu). From Waršuwa I went to Ikakališ. From Ikakališ I went to Tašḫiniya" (§§ 2-4). The Hittite vocabulary employed in the itinerary is quite simple and prosaic (*paun* "I went", *ḥarninkun* "I sacked") and is shared by almost all known Hittite military narratives.

^{46c} H. Cancik, *ibid.* 79-80.

⁴⁷ A. Goetze in *JCS* 16 (1962) 24ff. has suggested that this may represent a Hittite scribe's misunderstanding of Sumerian MU.IM.MA (= Akkadian *šad-daqda* "the previous year, last year"), thinking it to be equivalent to Akkadian *ana balāṭ* "in the following year", the formula employed in the Akkadian version of Hattušili's annals. If so, the same mistake was not made in all copies of the Hittite version, for KBo X 3 i 15 ("D") has MU-an-n[i-ma], just as Muršili II in his Ten-Year Annals.

⁴⁸ KBo IV 4 iv 42 (A. Goetze, *Die Annalen des Muršilis* [MVAeG 38, 1933], henceforward *AM* 138-140); H. A. Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (1974) 12.

3.7 The phraseology of the Hattušili I annals is by no means so stereotyped as the greater part of the Ten-Year Annals of Muršili, but it resembles in its greater variety of phraseology the latter's Detailed Annals and of col. IV of KUB 26,71 (cf. [8.2]). The author does not, for instance, find it necessary in enumerating each victory to credit the divine assistance in some stock line such as "the gods ran before me and I smote the enemy". Rather, divine assistance is described in several ways and rarely in the same way twice. The Akkadian version at § 5 speaks of the goddess placing the king on her lap⁴⁹. The Hittite version is broken at this point. The gesture is protective, as can be seen from the Akkadian references cited by von Soden⁵⁰. It is known from only one other Hittite text, the mythological tale of the Fisherman and the Foundling (CTH 363)⁵¹, where its significance is also protective, if not legitimizing⁵². Hattušili's description of the deity running before him in battle (i.e., aiding him) in § 5 is shared by virtually all subsequent combat descriptions in Hittite. In §§ 7 and 14 the Hittite version contains the phrase "in the midst of the lands the sun god(dess) stood (and aided me)". But in the one place where the corresponding expression in the Akkadian version is intact it reads "(the sun god stood) for the protection of the lands"⁵³ or "to the rear of the mountains"⁵⁴. However it is resolved in detail, the expression is striking and apparently was not subsequently employed by other writers of military annals.

3.8 Since a prime function of the Hittite royal annals was the commemoration of the manly exploits, wisdom, and achievements of the king (on which see further in [12.1]), it is clearly important to note how each of the various annalistic compositions presents the royal person.

3.9 Foremost is the titulary, which begins the inscription. H gives: "[Thus (says) the *tabar*]na, Hattušili, Great King, [king of the land of Hat]ti, man of Kuššar ... the brother's son of the *tawananna*", while A offers only the strictly abbreviated: "the Great King, the *tabarna* ... [the brother's son] of the *tawa*[nanna]". "The *tabarna*" is a dynastic title, probably of Hattic linguistic origin. "Great King" expresses the king's claim

⁴⁹ *ana sūnišu iškunšu*, KBo X 1 obv. 13.

⁵⁰ *AHw* 1059, righthand col., near top, sub 1,c.

⁵¹ KUB XXIV 7 iv 40; cf. H. A. Hoffner, *JNES* 27 (1968) 201 with note 27.

⁵² The phrase: "(the deity) took me/him by the hand" also occurs in §§ 5 and 9. Muršili II's Detailed Annals (KBo V 8 iii 41-42) has: *numu* ⁴U NIR.GÁL EN-IA ŠU-an *harzi našmu pīran huyan*za "The mighty storm god, my lord, holds my hand and runs before me", and the Apology of Hattušili, I 21: *numu* ⁴IŠTAR GAŠAN-IA ŠU-za IŠBAT "Ishtar, my lady, held me by the hand".

⁵³ *ana ki<di>nnat mātāti*; so A. Goetze, *JCS* 16 (1962) 25f.

⁵⁴ *ana qinnat šadē*; *AHw* 922, left col., sub 3,a.

to hegemony over other kingdoms, important in view of the record of military expeditions and conquests which follow, and the striking scenes of the submission and humiliation of opposing kings both in § 20 and at the conclusion of the Anitta text (§ 19). "Man of Kuššar" identifies Hattušili's first royal center, and "brother's son of the *tawananna*" explains his blood tie to the preceding royal couple. For the purpose of the annalistic propaganda perhaps the crucial title among these is "Great King", and it is therefore no coincidence that even the shorter titulary in A contains it.

3.10 Only one simile is applied to the king: the lion. This animal is a favorite royal symbol for Hattušili I. He employs it both in his annals (§ 10 = H ii 18f., A obv. 34-35, § 15 = H iii 1, A rev. 2f.) and in his political testament (§ 7 = KUB I 16 ii 37-41; cf. [5.2]). It was also employed in Anitta text § 6 (KBo III 22+obv 26), possibly also as a royal epithet. It is not used by any other Hittite monarch, although it is clearly a part of the Hittite royal ideology, as seen in its employment in the ceremonies for the foundation of a new palace KUB XXIX 1 ii 42-54 (cf. *ANET* 358). The lion also figures prominently in the monumental art of the Hittites. It can be an adjunct to the representation of deities⁵⁵. The famous lion gate of Hattuša could conceivably portray royal attributes.

3.11 In fact, not only is the lion simile peculiar to Hattušili I's annals, but similes of any kind are virtually non-existent in other Hittite royal annals. Only Hattušili III in his Apology makes use of them, and even he employs them of the enemies of the king rather than the king himself⁵⁶. This general failure to employ the simile in the royal annals is particularly striking, when one considers how extremely common simile and metaphor are in other genres of Hittite literature, particularly myth and ritual, and in contrast with Assyrian royal annals where such similes also abound⁵⁷.

3.12 If the lion simile emphasized the savage strength of the king in battle, his pioneering achievements were stressed in the crossing of the Euphrates "on foot" (i.e., over a bridge), an achievement which he boasts (KBo X 2 iii 29-31) only one previous great king was able to perform, Sargon the Great of Akkad. Such boasting of near unique achievements, while common enough in Assyrian annals, is by no means so in Hittite ones. More significant, as noted by Cancik, is the king's attempt to defend his

⁵⁵ K. Bittel and others, *Yazılıkaya* (WVDOG 61 [1941]) 102f., 127f., 152ff. On representations of the lion in ceramics see Fischer, WVDOG 75, 80f.

⁵⁶ Apology of Hattušili, IV 31 (of Urhitešub). Cf. too KBo VII 14 i 5 (Old Hittite).

⁵⁷ A. Schott, *Die Vergleiche in den akkadischen Königsinschriften* (MVAeG 30/2).

claim to priority against a charge of factual inaccuracy⁵⁸. The addition "Sargon indeed crossed it, but I (also) defeated the troops of Hahha" was intended to rescue the king's boast. It shows that even the earliest kings sought to affirm and defend the veracity of their statements in historical texts.

3.13 The Hattušili annals portray the king not only as ferocious and courageous, but also as the saviour of the oppressed. Thus in § 17 the king claims: "I ... took the hands of (the enemy king's) slave girls from the handmills, I took the hands of his slave men from the sickles. I exempted them from taxes and corvée. I unharnessed them. I bestowed them on (the temple of) the Sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady". Annals of other kings may present them as showing mercy on a foe who submits (Anitta § 2), but no other casts its protagonist in the role of deliverer of oppressed subjects. That Hattušili I considered pity a necessary royal capacity is seen in his Political Testament, §§ 1-2, 16; cf. [5.1].

3.14 The cities of recalcitrant foes could expect only the direst of fates. The city would be burned (§ 19) with the smoke ascending to the storm god, and/or the entire terrain surrounding the city, where crops would normally be cultivated, would be sown with salt and/or cress (Akkad. *sahlû*), cf. § 6. In § 6 no curse is mentioned accompanying the sowing of cress, although such sowing is combined with a curse in Anitta text §§ 11-12 (cf. [2.7]). The wording of the Akkadian version is obscure, but it probably indicates that the land must never again be cultivated. Later kings burned crops, but did not sow the landscape with salt and cress.

3.15 The king as a pious servant of his gods is depicted as dedicating the more impressive items of booty to the temples of the state deities (so in §§ 2-3, 6-7, 12-13, 17-18), who in this text are the sun goddess of Arinna, the storm god of heaven, and the goddess Mezzulla.

3.16 Common in later annals are the deportees (Sum. *NAM.RA*, Hitt. *arnuwalas*), which the Hittite king carries back to Hattuša. They are conspicuously lacking in texts from this early date. Also missing from this text, but found commonly in later ones, is the permanent subjection of foes, the imposition of regular tribute, and troop levies.

3.17 In sum this text, entitled in its colophon "the manly deeds of Hattušili", attempts to glorify the Hittite king by the recitation of his titles, the recounting of his military exploits, and the listing of his many gifts of booty to the temples of the principal state deities. It is very boastful in tone and more preoccupied with rhetoric than the better preserved examples of later annals. Credit is given to the gods for their as-

⁵⁸ H. Cancik, *Mythische und historische Wahrheit* 79-80.

sistance, but in the actual wording of the description of battles much less prominence is given to the gods than, for example, in Muršili II or Hattušili III texts. The king is not quite so helpless a pawn in the hands of the almighty gods; he is robust, active, and ready always to seize the initiative. In Old Hittite ideology the king's possession of moral integrity, wisdom, courage, compassion, and strength are primary. In the Empire period divine election, patronage and assistance assumed much more importance. The difference in outlook is particularly marked between the political apologies of Telepinu and Hattušili III. See [9.0 ff.] and [13.0 ff.]. On the other hand, some of the differences between Hattušili I texts and later ones are more than likely due to the peculiar personality of Hattušili I himself, a man who left a deep impression on both his contemporaries and subsequent generations of his countrymen.

4.0 Another text dating from the reign of Hattušili which stresses vividly the overwhelming superiority of the king to his lieutenants in wisdom, courage and strength, is the account of the Siege of Uršu⁵⁹. This text is classified in [18.1] under II. Preserved only in an Akkadian translation, it is narrated in the third person (cf. 3.12) and has a thoroughly secular outlook. The storm god's name is invoked only in a curse. In no place do the gods influence the course of events.

4.1 In this text too it is the battle scene which serves to convey the remarkable qualities of kingly leadership possessed by Hattušili. But whereas in the Hattušili annals the chronological scheme is very prominent, in the Uršu text time seems to stand stock still. One can almost understand how the first scholars to study this text confused its obverse with its reverse. For in terms of content alone one could almost interchange them at will with no loss in comprehension. The geographical and historical setting is genuine, and the siege itself is not fictitious. The king's lieutenants bear names which are known to us from other historical documents datable to the reign of Hattušili I, so that they *may* be the same individuals⁶⁰. But we cannot know if precisely these incidents and conversations took place during the course of the siege of Uršu. It appears to be a fictitious narrative embellishing a real event, intended to paint a portrait of the wise, courageous, and forceful king, impatient with his incompetent subordinates⁶¹.

4.2 Since this text was composed in the Akkadian language, one cannot compare its phraseology with the language of the Hittite historical

⁵⁹ Edited by H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 44 (1938) 113ff.

⁶⁰ See H. G. Güterbock, *ibid.*, and A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 139.

⁶¹ One thinks of the Königsnovelle genre, to which the Sargonic narrative *CTH* 310 also belongs.

texts. Nevertheless, one can see that despite the different language of composition the Uršu text is a real literary text with a style appropriate to such a text. Here there are no itineraries, listings of booty, or the like. Instead, as in most literary texts, there is a superabundance of dialogue. The language is calculated to express the intense emotions of the speakers. It is very vivid⁶³.

4.3 Attention has been drawn to the motif of "failures" or "mistakes" in this composition, a theme which it shares with other historical texts from this early period⁶³. While it is undeniable that this motif is present, one may properly ask if the focus here is upon the persons guilty of failure or upon the king who detects and punishes the failures. Surely it is the latter (cf. [5.1]). The culprits bear names (and they may be authentic ones), as in the Palace Chronicle, but they serve only as living evidence of the exacting standards of loyalty, honesty, and obedience imposed by the king upon his servants. The same "lesson" is taught in the Political Testament (cf. [5.1]) and the Palace Chronicle (cf. [6.2]) where however a unified historical setting such as the Uršu siege is absent, leaving a loose collection of anecdotes bound together only by the dating of the persons and events to the lifetimes of Hattušili I and Muršili I. So whereas in the Manly Deeds of Hattušili the historical narrative was drawn up with the single purpose of glorifying the king, the Siege of Uršu serves both the glorification of the king and the admonition of his servants. Neither text shows any trace of a disinterested pursuit of knowledge about the past.

5.0 The Political Testament of Hattušili (CTH 6)⁶⁴ employs the technique of recounting events of the past involving the king in order to justify a royal decree, which will effect important changes in the government and the society. As such it is the prototype of the so-called "historical prologues" to the Hittite state treaties of the 14th and 13th centuries. But in fact we have seen (cf. [3.5]) that the Hittites very early had learned to employ not only historical but legendary narrative to introduce and provide a rationale for the main subject matter of the text. This text, however, represents the earliest known example of an edict or decree so introduced. Later the same technique was applied with mo-

⁶³ An example of this vivid style from the Siege of Uršu is when the king angrily questions his officers: "Why have you not launched the attack? Are you standing on chariots of water? Did you also turn into water?... You acted very effeminately ... Last year Tudhaliya acted effeminately, and now you too have acted effeminately!" (KBo I 11 rev! 10ff.).

⁶³ See H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 44 (1938) 100, 104, 113; A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 139.

⁶⁴ Edition by F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I.* (1938), henceforward *HAB*.

difications by Telepinu (cf. [9.2])⁶⁵. This composition could be classified under III in the scheme of [18.1].

5.1 But like the Manly Deeds and the Siege of Uršu it too is inevitably concerned with the royal image. It too is at pains to portray the sovereign as wise, just, and even compassionate. In fact, the royal ideal is as much portrayed in its rejection by the unworthy sons and daughter (§§ 1-6, 12-18) as it is in its exemplification by Hattušili and his commands to Muršili I. The events of the past — the conspiracies and rebellions — are not arranged chronologically. The author is thus unconcerned with reconstructing temporal sequence. Nor does he (as a modern historian might) seek out the causes for these revolts in external factors⁶⁶. The factors and causes are all internal, resident in the character of the individual. The internal character traits of the individual actually resist the attempts to foster right behaviour: "I continued to give him instructions and cared for him continually. But he showed himself a youth not fit to be seen. Tears he did not shed. Mercy he did not show. He was cold; he was heartless. ... This warning of the king he did not take. The advice of his mother — that snake — he continually took" (§§ 1-2 = i/ii 4-10)⁶⁷. In all three cases where persons were led into misconduct by bad advice (the young Labarna in §§ 1-2, Huzzia in §§ 12-13, the un-named daughter in §§ 13-17, even the woman Heštiara in § 23) it was not because better counsel was unavailable. In each case the person chose to ignore the wisdom of the king in favor of the foolish and evil advice of others⁶⁸. It is for this reason that the king stresses to his servants that they raise the young king Muršili in the wisdom of his royal predecessor (§ 10).

5.2 Thus, while it is the good and wise counsel of the old king on which both the young crown prince and the other government officials can grow and develop into successful individuals, there is a certain pre-inclination either to accept or reject the king's word, which shows itself in the use of such terms as "snake" to describe the mother of Labarna (§ 4) and "lion" to describe the young Muršili (§ 7; cf. [3.10]). Hence the future behaviour of Labarna was utterly predictable (§§ 4-5). And Hattušili could say to Muršili: "My son, what is in your heart — always do!" (§ 22).

5.3 The Political Testament of Hattušili also offers an articulate philosophy of history and of state which resembles in all essentials that

⁶⁵ A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 141ff.

⁶⁶ It is true that in § 12 the people of the town of Tappaššanda intimidated the young Huzziya and encouraged him to rebel against his father, as it is true that in § 11 the elderly king issues a warning against allowing the town elders of various locales to seek special favors from the young Muršili.

⁶⁷ F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *HAB* 2-3.

⁶⁸ Thus are the passages cited in note 66 to be understood.

of the Telepinu Proclamation (cf. [9.0-6]). The conditions for a flourishing and successful Hittite state and monarchy are a thoroughly unified royal family ("let your clan be united like that of a *wetnaš*-animal!" and §§ 8-9 in general compared with Tel. Procl. §§ 1, 5, 8, 29), rejection of individual ambitions contrary to the interests of the royal family as a whole (§§ 11-12), conscientious following of the wise counsel of the king and unswerving obedience to his decrees (§§ 19-21), and prompt punishment through proper legally established instruments (such as the *pankuš*)⁶⁹ of all misdeeds, especially bloodshed in the royal family (§ 22, with which compare Tel. Procl. §§ 30-33).

5.4 Very similar in style and content to the Political Testament is a fragment of another Hattušili I edict (*CTH* 5 = KBo III 27 = BoTU 10β)⁷⁰. Several specific sentences in this fragment echo parts of the Political Testament: (1) the condemnation of the seditious behaviour of the queen (the Tawananna; lines 1'-12', to be compared with Pol. Test. §§ 1-4), (2) the rejection of the former heir apparent, the young Labarna (lines 13'-14', to be compared with Pol. Test. § 3), (3) the proclamation of Muršili as the new heir apparent and crown prince designate (lines 13'-14', compare Pol. Test. § 7), (4) the command to maintain unity in the royal clan (lines 15'-16', compare Pol. Test. § 8, where an animal other than the wolf is employed in the simile), (5) swift punishment of those who do not obey the royal decrees (lines 8'-12', 16'-21', compare Pol. Test. § 22). To be sure, however, there are certain marked differences in phraseology. Both texts show the vivid, bold imagery so characteristic of Hattušili I (cf. [3.24] and [4.2]) — "let them cut his throat and hang him in his gate!" (lines 9'-12'), "let the clan of you, my servants, be one — like that of a wolf!" (lines 15'-16'), "(when) ye violate my word, then in the fireplace ye will not fan the fire, (and) a serpent shall coil itself around the city of Hattuša!" (lines 24'-27'). The same linking of obedience to the king's wise words to the prosperity of the kingdom which one finds in Pol. Test. § 21 is found here (lines 22' ff.). The admonitory examples from history, which in Pol. Test. are largely individual members of the royal family, here include cities as well: Zalpa and Haššu (lines 28'-31'), on which also cf. [2.3].

6.0 At least one exemplar (KUB XXXVI 104 = D) of the so-called "Palace Chronicle" (*CTH* 8) has the old handwriting. The language of

⁶⁹ On the *pankuš* see A. Goetze in G. Walser (editor), *Neuere Hethiterforschung* (1964) 25ff. with citation of earlier literature.

⁷⁰ See H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 44 (1938) 99; F. Sommer in *HAB* 211ff.; H. G. Güterbock, *Journal of World History* 2 (1954) 384; and M. Vieyra in R. Labat (editor), *Religions du Proche Orient* (1970) 471f.

the composition throughout is Old Hittite, so that a date for the original writing around the end of the 17th century B.C. (using the Middle Chronology adopted for the *Cambridge Ancient History*) cannot be challenged. The find spots of only the more recently excavated tablets are known. All of them come from the dumps of earlier excavations at the House on the Slope (quadrant L/18). Two other pieces, which may belong to this composition (KBo VIII 41 and 42) were found in 1954 on the acropolis. Found in secondary locations, both pieces undoubtedly came originally from Building A.

6.1 The "Palace Chronicle"⁷¹ is really not a chronicle, since it does not seek to arrange all events related therein strictly chronologically. It is a loosely organized collection of anecdotes concerning officials of the Hittite king (see [18.1], III). Most of the stories take place in the reign of the "father of the king", probably Hattušili I (cf. [2.5]), which fixes the time of composition in the reign of Muršili I. The dating is determined by the occurrence in the text of names of officials known from other documents relating to the reigns of Hattušili I and Muršili II: Šanda, Nunnu, Kuliait/Kulet, Zidi, and Hištaiar(a).

6.2 Some of the anecdotes (grouped together toward the end of the composition) are quite uncomplimentary to the officials involved and show how the king punished dishonesty and incompetence among his underlings. This is, of course, the same manner of portraying the royal person which we saw in the narrative of the Siege of Uršu (cf. [4.3]) and less pronounced in the Political Testament of Hattušili (cf. [5.1] and [5.2]). The same kind of anecdote is employed in the New Kingdom occasionally in vassal treaties. Preserving the feature of the royal fury seen so clearly in the Siege of Uršu is a story found in an instructions text about a water-carrier whose negligence resulted in a hair getting into the royal drinking water⁷². There is a certain grim humor in the coincidence that the culprit, proven guilty by a river ordeal, bears the name of a well known Hittite river and its god — Zuliya!

6.3 Like the Siege of Uršu the Palace Chronicle is a purely secular document, which not once betrays a genuine religiosity or any hint that the gods might operate as forces behind events (cf. [4.0]). The narrative is couched in a detached language with the narrator in no way involved (third person narrative throughout).

7.0 Certain fragments relative to Muršili's expedition against Babylon (CTH 10), which Kammenhuber classes as "Old Hittite chronicle

⁷¹ H. G. Güterbock, *ZA* 44 (1938) 100ff.; A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 139.

⁷² KUB XIII 3 iii 21ff., translated by J. Friedrich, *MAOG* 4 (1928) 46ff., and A. Goetze, *ANET* 207.

literature", have been known for quite a while. In 1969 a duplicate to one of these pieces (*CTH* 10.2) was recovered from the dumps of earlier excavations in the Big Temple (quadrant K/19 of the Lower City)⁷³. None of the fragments which comprise this composition is in the old writing; each gives every indication of being a late copy.

7.1 *CTH* 10.1 and *CTH* 11 are quite similar in content. They relate in the third person the more important military exploits of Muršili and then proceed to tell of his assassination. They praise Muršili and consider him the equal of his illustrious predecessor: "He too was a first-rank [king]"⁷⁴. *CTH* 11.A (KBo III 57) may have been a *Sammeltafel*, containing in col. III a first person narrative of the reign of Hantili, and in the first two columns, accounts of the reigns of his predecessors⁷⁵. Not to be excluded, however, is the possibility that it was one continuous new composition which, like the Tel. Procl., used older sources. In the latter case, the outlook throughout would have to have been uniform, a single, coherent view of events over several kings' reigns.

7.2 But *CTH* 10.2 differs from *CTH* 10.1 and *CTH* 11, in that it makes extensive use of first person plural verb forms. One is reminded of *CTH* 17.1 (KBo III 60), col. III, where the narrative also unfolds in first person plural verbs. It too deals with campaigns of Muršili I in Syria. Also in first person plural narrative, but not dealing with military matters, is the merchants' tale *ABoT* 49+2007/u+1160/c from acropolis Building A (with duplicate KBo XII 42 from the House on the Slope)⁷⁶. Many details of the interpretation of *CTH* 17.1 remain obscure. But its pertinence to *CTH* 10.2 should be carefully weighed, and that of *CTH* 10.1 to *CTH* 10.2 questioned.

7.3 A join piece to exemplar B of *CTH* 13, which deals with Muršili's wars against the Hurrians, was recovered in 1963 from the dumps of the earlier excavation in the area of the Big Temple in the Lower City⁷⁷. This means that at least one copy of this composition was kept in the same tablet collection as the Zalpa Story (*CTH* 3.1 and 3.4), the narrative of Muršili's wars against Babylon (*CTH* 10.2), the narratives about Yarimlim,

⁷³ KBo XXII 7 was found in the "Grabungsschutt". H. A. Hoffner attempted to interpret this piece and the older duplicate in H. Goedicke and J. Roberts (editors), *Unity and Diversity* (Baltimore-London 1975) 56ff.

⁷⁴ KUB XXVI 74 i 7-8; KBo III 57 ii 5. This phrase and the general style of *CTH* 10 were consciously imitated many centuries later by Hattušili III in his historical review, a fragment of which is preserved in KUB XXI 24 and KBo XXII 11 (cf. *CTH* 84).

⁷⁵ So claimed by A. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 143 note 37, second paragraph.

⁷⁶ See edition of two published pieces by H. Hoffner in *JCS* 22 (1968) pp. 34ff.

⁷⁷ KBo XIX 90 (inventory number 662/v).

Atradu and Hammurapi (*CTH* 14.1, 14.2, 14.4A), and copies B and F of the Telepinu Proclamation (*CTH* 19), all of which are historical texts from originals in the Old Hittite period. Cf. [1.10-11]. None of the copies of *CTH* 13 shows the Old Hittite writing, although the language is Old Hittite.

7.4 *CTH* 13 unlike *CTH* 10 and 11 is narrated by Muršili himself in the first person singular, which suggests that the text may be annals (cf. above in [3.5] and below in [8.0]). At least the narration is put into the mouth of the king himself. It is therefore an unlikely candidate for Kammenhuber's chronicle literature⁷⁸.

7.5 The passage of time is indicated at several points by the notation that someone (always third person, therefore not Muršili⁷⁹) "passed the winter" (obv. 36, rev. 26) in a certain area. There are no formulas such as "in the next year", which sometimes marks the annalistic style.

7.6 Once in a broken passage (rev. 2') the "father of the king" is mentioned. This may have been Forrer's reason for considering that side of the tablet the obverse⁸⁰. For if the composition attempts a vaguely chronological scheme, the activities of Hattušili I (or narrative which involves him) should be found near the beginning.

8.0 The "Ammuna Chronicle" (*CTH* 18)⁸¹ is preserved in three copies, none of which shows the old handwriting. Find spots are not known for any of the pieces. The narrative is introduced by the phrase "thus (says) Ammuna, the Great King", and what follows in col. I of copy A is narrated in the first person (cf. [3.5], [7.4]). Columns II and III of A are broken away. Column IV has one clear example of the king's activity narrated in the third person (iv 14). Because of the loss of the intervening two columns, one cannot be sure the material in col. IV is part of the same Ammuna text which began in col. I.

8.1 The text is important for the reconstruction of Hittite history, because it presents quite a different picture of Ammuna, whom the Te-

⁷⁸ So attributed by her (*Saeculum* 9 [1958] 143) as "die vermutlich alle zur Chronikliteratur gehörigen Fragmente, die Laroche in: *RHA* 58, S. 35 (ff.) unter Nr. 10-14 anführt". *CTH* 13 = *Cat.* 12 and therefore is included in "Nr. 10-14".

⁷⁹ Unless, of course, we have here evidence for a conflation of sources. In composing the annals in the first person, older itineraries drawn up in the third person could have been used. One would need the full context in order to be sure that the king himself was the subject of these third person verb forms.

⁸⁰ BoTU, p. 30.

⁸¹ See Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 143, end of note 37; edition of the rev., col. iv, by von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer* (1965) 185ff. Kammenhuber avoids classifying it as a chronicle, preferring "Selbstbericht dieses Königs". She also doubts that it can be considered a predecessor of the annals texts of the Empire Period.

lepinu Proclamation portrays as the "bad luck king" (cf. [9.5]). Nothing in the Ammuna Chronicle suggests any lack of piety on the king's part; nothing suggests that his reign was marked by failures. And if col. IV of KUB XXVI 71 belongs to the same composition as col. I, the narrative there even suggests that Ammuna's lieutenants exercised control over areas to the north and north-east of the capital which lay in the heart of areas (such as Tibiya) which were later controlled by the troublesome Kaška tribes. In fact the narrator in col. IV claims that "the king made the sea (his) border" ⁸², an expression quite similar to one used in the Telepinu Proclamation to describe the highly successful reigns of Labarna and Hattušili I ⁸³.

8.2 The style of this text, which is quite similar to annals, is marked not only by first person narration, but also by indication of time sequence by "in that very same year" (i 22'), "in the second year" (iv 10'), and "[in the thir]d [year]" (iv 14'). In the preserved parts of the text there seem to be no stereotyped phrases to describe the divine assistance or indications of bringing booty back home to the temples in Hattuša (cf. [3.7]). The element of bravado is definitely missing (contrast [3.12-17]). The sense of temporal sequence, the full data on geographical points in the king's and his officials' itineraries, the inclusion of personal names and pertinent details about the activities of the king's lieutenants combine to give the impression of a highly competent historiographic technique. In fact the inclusion (in column IV) of rather full descriptions of the missions of the subordinates (not the anecdotal accounts of failures or successes with admonitory overtones) indicates that Old Hittite texts such as this one long anticipated much of the best in the annals style of Muršili II. What seems not to appear until Muršili is Cancik's "Metaschicht" ⁸⁴.

9.0 The Telepinu Proclamation (CTH 19) ⁸⁵, a literary product of the late Old Kingdom (c. 1500), has been preserved in an Akkadian version and nine exemplars of the Hittite version, of which two (B and F) were found in the area of the Great Temple in the Lower City, and three (A, G, H) in the area of the House on the Slope. The account of Telepinu's campaign against the land of Lahha (CTH 20), which is composed in the first person, was also recovered in the area of the House on the Slope, while

⁸² LUGAL-uš a-ru-na-an ar-ha-an IŠ-BAT (2BoTU 30 rev iv 14');

⁸³ nu-uš a-ru-na-aš ir-hu-uš i-e-et (2BoTU 23A i 8, etc.).

⁸⁴ H. Cancik, *Grundzüge* 35ff.

⁸⁵ Old edition of Sturtevant & Bechtel, *Hittite Chrestomathy* (1935) 175ff. based upon texts assembled by Forrer in BoTU 23. An unpublished Munich dissertation by Eiserle, which attempts a new edition, was not available to me here in Chicago. Cf. Kammenhuber, *Saeculum* 9 (1958) pp. 142 and 144, O. R. Gurney in *CAH*², fasc. 44, pp. 3-10.

one copy of that king's treaty with Išputahšu of Kizzuwatna was recovered in the area of the Great Temple. No records pertaining to this king's reign therefore have yet been determined to come from the acropolis archives.

9.1 The language of the Telepinu Proclamation is not so archaic as that of compositions from the reigns of Hattušili I and Muršili I. Of the various exemplars, B seems to show a more archaic language. This copy ⁸⁶, which was found in the Great Temple area, is not, however, in the old handwriting.

9.2 The form of the document is that of a decree or edict. The introductory formula "thus (says) the Tabarna, Telepinu, the Great King" is not in itself evidence for the decree form. The "Ammuna Chronicle" (cf. 8.0) began "thus (says) Ammuna, the Great King". What clearly marks it as a decree is its final sections (§§ 27-50), which reveal that the first 26 sections constitute in fact an unusually long historical prologue to the decree proper. From the documents of the earlier Old Kingdom we have seen that legendary traditions could serve as an explanatory prologue to historical narrative (cf. [3.5]). We have seen that the first attempt to use a rehearsal of previous events to provide a background for a decree was in the Political Testament of Hattušili (cf. [5.0]). But the organization of that text is such that the historical reminiscences (which have the anecdotal flavor) are intermingled with the king's commands and admonitions to his subjects, thus failing to show the neat sequence of historical prologue followed by decree which is found for the first time in Telepinu and then becomes a regular feature of the state treaties during the reigns of Šuppiluliuma I and his successors.

9.3 I have attempted elsewhere to show that the Telepinu Proclamation exhibits the same broad outline in its historical section as the Apology of Hattušili III ⁸⁷. Both texts were authored by usurpers concerned with justifying their accessions. Both chose to do so through a rehearsal of events which stretch back far beyond the reign of the king whom each overthrew. Each seeks to show that he belongs to a line of legitimate and successful remote predecessors, whose principles were betrayed by the king whom the usurper-author removed. Both texts conclude with decrees. To be sure there are differences between the two compositions. Hattušili III rests his defense not only on the unworthiness of his predecessor (the horizontal plane) and the dangers which this unworthiness posed for the kingdom, but also on his election from childhood

⁸⁶ KBo XIX 96+KUB XI 1.

⁸⁷ In Goedicke & Roberts (eds.), *Unity and Diversity* 51ff.

by Ishtar of Šamuha, who by her divine power (the key term: *para han-dandatar*) and control over the events of history brings about the downfall of Urhitešub and the passage of power to Hattušili (the vertical plane). Telepinu, on the contrary, attributes his rise to power to no patron deity. At best he sees divine disapproval⁸⁸ of the widespread bloodshed in the royal family attending the reigns of his immediate predecessors, a factor in their ineffectiveness and the disasters which attended their period of rule (§§ 12-22, 27). One could say that the Telepinu Proclamation shares with most Old Hittite historical texts a more secular outlook than most of the analogous New Kingdom texts.

9.4 The Telepinu Proclamation represents the clearest example from the Old Kingdom of an attempt to show a pattern in a somewhat lengthy period of past events. The temporal sequence is evident in the succession of reigns from Labarna through Huzziya. But as a rule only general statements are made about successes and failures. When occasionally a particular datable historical event (such as Muršili's expeditions against Aleppo, Babylon, and the Hurrians) is included, it is thought that the author has drawn upon a written source such as *CTH* 10 and 11 (cf. above in [7.0]-[7.2]). His debt to earlier written sources is evident at many points in phrases which he has lifted almost verbatim from earlier historical documents. In BoTU 30, Col. IV (*CTH* 18; cf. [8.0]-[8.2]) he found the phrase "he held the sea(-coast) as (his) border".

9.5 The Telepinu Proclamation is the only example known from Hittite historical literature of a text which establishes one or two criteria for measuring the success of kings and then relates a long series of reigns to illustrate the point. Such a text from Mesopotamia is the Weidner Chronicle. From ancient Israel we know of the work of the so-called "Deuteronomic history". It is often the case in such works that evidence is distorted or even invented in order to save the theory. For this reason Hittitologists have long distrusted the historical sections of the Telepinu Proclamation. For some periods of Old Kingdom history it is our only source of information. Then we have no alternative but to use it. But when there are other historical sources, one avoids drawing conclusions based exclusively on information from this text.

10.0 For the reigns of Telepinu's immediate successors, Alluwamna, Hantili II, Zidanza II and Huzziya II there is very little historical documentation. Under *CTH* 23 Laroche groups three fragments which men-

⁸⁸ "Then the gods avenged the blood of . . ." (§ 19, i 66ff.; § 20, i 69ff.); "even the men of the gods (*šuman antuḫšišša*) are saying: Behold in Hattuša bloodshed has become widespread!" (§ 27, ii 32ff.). Cf. H. A. Hoffner in Goedicke & Roberts, *Unity* 53f.

tion an Alluwamna. *CTH* 25 is a treaty of a Hittite king named Zidanza with Pilliya, king of Kizzuwatna. Adherents to the short chronologies of Hittite history assign this treaty to Zidanza I, the father of Ammuna, who killed Pišeni, Hanteli's son and heir, and became king after Hanteli I. (c. 1565-1555) ⁸⁹. Adherents to the longer chronology, who tend to give more credence to the native historical tradition of kings between Telepinu and Šuppiluliuma I, consider the chronological sequence of Kizzuwatna treaties (and thus the sequence of Kizzuwatna rulers) to be Išputahšu, Pilliya, Paddatiššu, Šunaššura, thus assigning the Pilliya treaty to a second Zidanza (c. 1480-1470) ⁹⁰. Since none of these early Kizzuwatna treaties contain historical prologues, there exists no historiography for the kings between Telepinu and Tudhaliya II (c. 1460-1440).

10.1 The attribution of historical texts to the period between Tudhaliya II and Šuppiluliuma I is subject to the controversy which presently exists over the use of certain linguistic and to a lesser extent paleographic criteria to date texts to the 15th century. Otten, Güterbock, Carruba, Houwink ten Cate and others have sought to establish the linguistic characteristics of this stage in the developing Hittite language, which they call "Middle Hittite" ⁹¹. Their most vocal opponent is Kammenhuber, who views the mixture of older forms with younger in such texts as signs of conscious archaizing which took place at the very end of the New Kingdom (last decades of the 12th century) ⁹². Laroche has adopted a mediating position in *CTH*, grouping the historical texts written in this language together under the heading "texts of uncertain date" (*CTH* 131-147). These texts include *inter alia* annals of a king Tudhaliya (*CTH* 142) and of a king Arnuwanda (*CTH* 143), which may pertain to Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I.

Since compositions in what we may surely call an annalistic style were made during the Old Kingdom itself by Hattušili I there is only the linguistic controversy to hinder the full acceptance of these annals as belonging to Tudhaliya II and Arnuwanda I. Houwink ten Cate and Gurney have tried to show that the historical data contained in these annals and in the Madduwatta and Mita texts fit well into the larger historical picture

⁸⁹ H. Otten, *JCS* 5 (1951) 129ff.

⁹⁰ H. G. Güterbock, *CHM* 2 (1954) 385, n. 17; B. Landsberger, *JCS* 8 (1954) 19, n. 49; A. Goetze, *JCS* 11 (1957) 72ff.; O. R. Gurney in *CAH*², fasc. 44 (1966) 5, 14-15.

⁹¹ O. Carruba, *Die Sprache* 12 (1966) 79f.; H. Otten, *StBoT* 11 (1969); Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (1962). My position is outlined in *JNES* 31 (1972) 29-35.

⁹² *KZ* 83 (1969) 256ff.; *Or* 38 (1969) 548ff.; *MSS* 28 (1970) 51ff.; 29 (1971) 75ff. And cf. now THeth 9.

in both Anatolia and Syria of the 15th century ⁹³. Too little of these compositions is preserved to allow the kind of detailed stylistic analysis that is possible for the Annals of Hattušili I or the two annalistic works of Muṣṣili II (cf. below in [12.1] and following). But it can be said that the style is more similar to the later Muṣṣili annals than to the earlier Hattušili I ones.

10.2 In form the Madduwatta text ⁹⁴ resembles a very long treaty prologue without the body of stipulations which follow. It differs from the treaty prologues in the absence of the introductory formula and titular: "Thus (says) My Sun, (royal name), Great King, King of Hatti, beloved of the Storm God, son of (royal name and titles)".

10.3 Temporal sequence is observed but not assigned to individual years. Since the addressee, Madduwatta, who is also the principal subject of the narrative, is an older contemporary, the present Hittite king first narrates Madduwatta's dealings with the previous Hittite king (§§ 1-5, 8-15), and summarizes the treaty obligations imposed upon Madduwatta at that time (§§ 6-7). These obligations he accuses Madduwatta of breaking. In 1958 Kammenhuber wrote of the Madduwatta text: "Die eigenartige Anklageschrift gegen Madduwatta ... gehört hingegen nicht zur Geschichtsschreibung, sondern kann eher als Ersatz für einen dank der damaligen Schwäche des Hethiterkönigs nicht mehr möglichen Staatsvertrag angesehen werden" ⁹⁵. Such a statement rests upon chronological and historical premises which are no longer accepted by most Hittitologists. Excluding the question of the date of the composition, one must still ask if the rehearsal of events in argumentation, whether they be found in annals, treaty prologues, letters, or elsewhere, is not entitled to the designation *Geschichtsschreibung*. One may deem such a narrative tendentious, propagandistic or limited in scope, all of which the Madduwatta text undeniably is. But it is also history-writing of a very utilitarian sort such as was practised by the Hittites from the very beginnings to the end of their kingdom.

10.4 Such historical prologues, whether they introduced decrees or treaties, tended to employ first and second person verb forms and pronouns to a much greater degree than other forms of historiographic literature. In the case of the annals and chronicle literature, on the contrary, there were no addressees, therefore no second person forms.

⁹³ Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *Records* 57ff.; O. R. Gurney in *CAH*³, vol. II, chap. xv (fasc. 44).

⁹⁴ KUB XIV 1 + KBo XIX 38; older edition: A. Götze, *MVAeG* 32 (1928); newer study by H. Otten, *StBoT* 11 (1969).

⁹⁵ *Saeculum* 9, 144.

11.0 Historical prologues to proper state treaties exist for the reigns of Šuppiluliuma I, Muršili II, Muwatalli, Hattušili III, Tudhaliya IV, and Šuppiluliuma II. In addition decrees (or edicts) from the reign of Hattušili III occasionally have historical prologues ⁹⁶, as do some of the royal prayers from this period ⁹⁷. As noted above, these rehearsals of events are extremely tendentious. The treaty prologues are at pains to portray the beneficence and wisdom of Hittite imperial foreign policy. One must read between the lines and penetrate behind the façade in order to determine what may actually have happened. But our concern is not primarily with these sources as evidence for real happenings but rather as objects of study in their own right, as evidence for the way their authors saw (or would like us to see) the events described. We are concerned with what they are trying to do and how they go about doing it, regardless of whether or not we approve.

11.1 The treaty prologues present the events of history as justifying Hittite imperial foreign policy at every turn and condemning all parties who seek to thwart that policy. The prologues to the decrees explain in historical terms the need for the decree and show it to be a proper and wise response to the situation. The prologues to the prayers maintain the complete integrity and piety of the worshiper or his/her spouse and the need for divine action to heal him or lengthen his life.

12.0 The reign of Muršili II witnessed the production of a large number of historical texts. Of greatest interest among these are three annalistic compositions: a Ten-Year Annals of Muršili (*CTH* 61.I), a Detailed Annals (*CTH* 61.II) which related events at least through the 21st year of the king's reign, and the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma (*CTH* 40) composed by Muršili ⁹⁸.

12.1 In his two important studies of Hittite historiography ⁹⁹ Hubert Cancik has made us aware of the unsuspected sophistication of literary technique employed by Hittite author-compilers of historical texts. And although Cancik's insights into the older compositions are also often helpful, his most notable contribution consists of his close examination of the Muršili annals, the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma, and the Hattušili III texts.

12.2 Although all Hittite historical texts exhibit to some degree the ability to organize the raw chronological, geographical and statistical data, and to present it in such a way as to reveal the motivations of the prin-

⁹⁶ E.g., KBo IV 12 (*CTH* 87), the decree in favor of Mittannamuwa.

⁹⁷ *CTH* 383 and 384, prayers of Hattušili and Puduhepa, to be edited by Ms. Judith O'Rear Barissas in her Yale dissertation.

⁹⁸ A. Götze, *AM* (MVAeG 38, 1933), and H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956) 41-68, 75-130.

⁹⁹ See below in [16.0] and notes 133 and 134.

cial actors, the causes or at least occasions of armed conflict, the political wisdom, military skill, justice, mercy, and cultic piety of the Hittite king, Cancik has demonstrated by his close analysis of the historical compositions of Muršili II and Hattušili III that the historiographic literary technique reached its acme during the late 14th and 13th centuries. It is impossible to prove anything conclusive about the organization of either the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma or Muršili's Detailed Annals, since both of these compositions contain large gaps, and in the former case it is not certain how one should order the fragments. Without a complete connected text, and especially without a preserved beginning and end, one cannot properly analyze a literary composition as to its structure. Realizing this, Cancik has used the Ten-Year Annals of Muršili, which is almost completely preserved, as his starting point. Reaching certain preliminary conclusions about the Ten-Year Annals, he then seeks to render plausible the same structure and technique for the others. Fundamental to the organization of the Ten-Year Annals, according to Cancik is a prologue, an epilogue which consciously resumes the prologue, and a symmetrical central section bisected by a "Binnenschluss" (internal conclusion). Within the central section episodes of two types alternate: (1) terse, report-like narratives ("Berichte") of Kaška campaigns, and (2) more literary descriptions ("Geschichten") of the protracted Arzawa war and other matters. In the latter one finds extensive use of speeches, letters, speculations about hypothetical courses of action either by the king or his opponent, portrayal of simultaneous happenings in different locations; in the former only stereotyped formulas. Cancik thinks that this alternation is a conscious literary technique, which proves that Muršili's Ten Year Annals were the end-product of an editorial process of selection and arrangement of narrative material from a larger corpus of written records.

12.3 The Ten-Year Annals certainly represents a unified composition. The epilogue was clearly already in view, as the prologue was being written. Each presupposes the other. One cannot avoid the conclusion that the author has been selective, for he informs his audience in the epilogue: "The enemy lands which the king's sons and the lords conquered are not included (here)" (§ 42). Furthermore, it is obvious that the corpus of written records of Muršili's campaigns included at least that extra material which appears in the Detailed Annals. It does not seem to me that there was an internal conclusion ("Binnenschluss") at the end of year four (§ 27). The end of year four is not described differently from the ends of other years, nor does year five (§ 28) begin remarkably differently. So far as I can see, the central section is a seamless whole. What differences in style exist between the alternating sections are minimal and could be outgrowths of the content. A question should be raised: What are the

boundaries of the alternating units? Cancik's first stereotyped section comprises two regnal years (§§ 7-11). When only two types of narrative are distinguished, it is a simple matter to argue that they "alternate", even if the types of paragraphs are represented schematically as AABA BBAAAABAA.

12.4 As in the Old Kingdom annals of Hattušili [3.8f.], the portrayal of the royal person is of paramount importance. If there is any remarkable difference between the Muršili II annals and the predecessors in this regard, it is probably an increased tendency on the part of the royal author to vindicate himself. Muršili seems always to be defending himself against real or imagined accusations. At the outset of both the Ten-Year and the Detailed Annals he seeks to counter the charge of the enemy lands that he is too young and too weak to fill his father's shoes. Again in year three Muršili takes cognizance of insults aimed at himself by Uhhaziti of Arzawa: "You have continually called me a child and have continually belittled me" ¹⁰⁰. Other texts from the reign of Muršili II show how his ego at times was greatly threatened (Muršili's Speech Loss) ¹⁰¹. They also show how he sought in the sins of his father the causes for the plague which ravaged his kingdom (Plague Prayers), thus seeking to show that the plague did not come through any sin of his own. One should therefore expect from such a king annals which vigorously seek to prove his manliness and piety.

12.5 The king's manliness is to be proven by the accounts of his military successes. His piety can be proven in several ways. Although Hittite annals are primarily limited in their subject-matter to the king's military activities, Muršili's include occasional allusions to the king's celebration of festivals ¹⁰² and his pious observance of the prescribed funeral rites for his brother Šarrikušuh/Piyaššili ¹⁰³. The measure of his standing before the gods could also be measured by the appeal to make a given battle show by its outcome the judgment of the deity (i.e., a kind of ordeal by battle) ¹⁰⁴. Later, Hattušili III was to appeal likewise to the gods' granting of victory over his opponents as a sign of the essential justness of his cause (cf. [13.0]) ¹⁰⁵. There is, however, no evidence for the em-

¹⁰⁰ KBo III 4 obv ii 12f. (= AM 46-47).

¹⁰¹ See the psychological insights in the discussion of A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* (Philadelphia 1956), 230ff. See Laroche, *CTH* 486.

¹⁰² KBo III 4 i 21 (= AM 20), ii 48 (= AM 58-60), KUB XIX 30 iv 12-13 (= AM 104-5), etc.

¹⁰³ KBo IV 4 i 6ff. (= AM 108ff.).

¹⁰⁴ KBo III 4 ii 13-14 (= AM 45-6), KUB XIV 17 iii 18-19 (= AM 97-99).

¹⁰⁵ *Hatt.* III 71-73.

ployment of this technique prior to Muršili¹⁰⁶. No earlier annals contain descriptions of this. In the description of Year Seven in the Detailed Annals the king writes: "Let the gods stand on my side and decide [the issue] in [my] favor!"¹⁰⁷

12.6 In contrast to the annals of Hattušili I and other preserved examples of earlier annals the Muršili II annals also develop a stereotyped phraseology for the divine aid rendered in the battlefield. Elements of this phraseology existed before, but the full and fixed form, which occurs quite frequently, appears first in texts from Muršili's reign. The formula in the Ten Year Annals reads as follows: "The sun goddess of Arinna, my lady, the mighty storm god, my lord, Mēzzulla, and all the gods ran before me, so that I defeated ..." ¹⁰⁸. In the Detailed Annals the formula was somewhat different: "The mighty storm god, my lord, the sun goddess of Arinna, my lady, the storm god of Hatti, the tutelary god of Hatti, the storm god of the army, Ishtar of the (battle-)field, and all the gods ran before me, so that ..." ¹⁰⁹.

12.7 The central term "(the gods) ran before (me)" is by no means first employed in military descriptions by Muršili II. It appears once in the annals of Hattušili I ("the sun goddess of Arinna ... took me by the hand and ran before me in battle") ¹¹⁰, and at least twice in the Middle Hittite annals of Tudhaliya ("the gods ran before") ¹¹¹. It is rather the full formula which is new in Muršili.

12.8 Muršili's annals credit the gods with the king's victories in more ways than through the use of these formulae. At times the king describes startling direct divine intervention in the course of the battles. During his campaign of year nine against the lands of Yahrešša and Piggainarešša an episode occurred which indicated the most specific form of divine assistance: "the mighty storm god, my lord, had summoned for me (the god) Hašammili, my lord, and he kept me hidden (= made me invisible?), so that no one saw me. And I went and attacked the land Piggainarešša as it slept" ¹¹². On another occasion the storm god hurled a lightning bolt against the enemy ¹¹³. On this latter occasion, the king employs to describe the god's open display of power on his behalf a special term which

¹⁰⁶ Unless it is in the broken passage from a text dealing with Muršili I: [...] -it ha-an-na-r[u?] ... (KBo III 46 obv 3).

¹⁰⁷ KUB XIV 17 iii 18-19 (AM 98f.).

¹⁰⁸ KBo III 4 i 38ff. (= AM 22ff.), etc.

¹⁰⁹ KBo IV 4 iv 9ff. (= AM 134 ff.), etc.

¹¹⁰ KBo X 2 obv i 29-30.

¹¹¹ KUB XXIII 11 obv ii 29, rev iii 24 (CTH 142).

¹¹² KBo IV 4 rev iii 33ff. (= AM 126ff.); also JNES 25 (1966) 172, lines 4ff.

¹¹³ KBo III 4 ii 16ff. (= AM 46ff.).

first appears in the historical literature at this time, the term *para han-dandatar*. This term is variously translated "göttliche Macht", "göttliche Gerechtigkeit, göttliche Rechtsordnung"¹¹⁴. The translation "divine justice" is suggested by a textual variant *nīg.sī.sā-tar*¹¹⁵, which shows that Hittite scribes could write this word with the Sumerogram which means "justice". The usage of the term suggests that it is the display of a god's overwhelming power in order to bring about a just resolution of a conflict. It is in this sense that the term is used first by Muršili II and later by Hattušili III in his political propaganda.

12.9 New with Muršili II is the concern to describe the terrain of some of the battle sites. In at least one instance the author even assumes that his statements about the terrain can be checked by the reader. "Now the city of Ura, which was the first border fortress [of the land of] Azzi, was situated in a very inaccessible place. Let whoever hears these tablets (read aloud) send and [look at] that city of Ura [how] it was [f]ortified!"¹¹⁶

13.0 One of the best-known Hittite texts of a historical nature is the so-called "autobiography" or "apology" of Hattušili III¹¹⁷. Scholars have not been able to agree completely on the designation of this text¹¹⁸. Like the Telepinu Proclamation it shares the formal features of an edict/decreed, but it is clear that this is only superficial. The historical introduction to the decree is very long, constituting all but the last two paragraphs of the text. Furthermore, it is also obvious that the composition is a piece of political propaganda designed to defame the dethroned king and his partisans and to give legitimacy to the new king. So argumentative is the tone, in fact, that at points the reader-hearer's objections are actually anticipated and answered! (cf. [3.12] and fn. 46b). "If someone should say: Why did you formerly establish him in kingship? And why now are you declaring war upon him? (I answer:) If he had not started the hostilities with me, would (the gods) truly have subjected a 'Great King' to a petty king?" (Hatt. III 74ff.).

13.1 In this text one finds the opposite of that view of history and

¹¹⁴ A. Götze, *Hatt.* 60; J. Friedrich, *HWb* 52 s.v.

¹¹⁵ ABoT 62 38; cf. H. G. Güterbock's note on p. x of ABoT Inhaltsübersicht.

¹¹⁶ KUB XIV 17 iii 21-24 (= *AM* 98).

¹¹⁷ Old edition by A. Götze in *MVAeG* 29 (1924) with supplements and corrections in *MVAeG* 34 (1930); new edition expected by H. Otten in *StBoT* series.

¹¹⁸ Detailed survey by Herbert M. Wolf in his Brandeis University dissertation: *The Apology of Hattušiliš Compared with other Political Self-justifications of the Ancient Near East* (Ann Arbor 1967). Cf. also H. A. Hoffner in Goedicke & Roberts (eds.), *Unity and Diversity* 51ff.

history-writing which sees events linked in a horizontal level by the principles of cause and effect; cf. [17.14]. It is true that no Hittite historical text ever approached this latter conception of history in its pure form. But in most texts there is at least a mixture of horizontal level causality and vertical (i.e., direct divine intervention). In this text every important event is caused by the goddess "Ishtar of Šamuha", who is Hattušili's patron deity. She brings all things about by that power known to the Hittites as *para handandatar* (cf. above in [12.8]). If there is any causality on the human level, it consists merely of one or more persons incurring the divine favor or disfavor and thus influencing the use of the goddess' *para handandatar*. "Because I was indued with (the goddess's) *para handandatar*, and because I walked before the gods in *para handandatar*". wrote Hattušili, "I never committed the evil deed(s) of mankind"¹¹⁹. It is probably too much to assume that all kings (even of the New Kingdom) were privileged to enjoy this endowment of divine power. For only Hattušili makes such claims. Muršili II saw this power unleashed on his behalf only rarely on the battle-field. We have no inkling as to how a human being (or even a king) came to secure the power from the deity. Even of himself Hattušili makes no statement that he earned this power. No special obedience or cultic observances secured it for him. It was strictly of the divine initiative and grace. Ishtar chose him as a child and vouchsafed to him her protection and constant solicitude.

13.2 Although such a view of history is the very antithesis of the conceptions held by modern western historians, the origins of which views are usually traced back to the Greeks, we must in all fairness admit that it is "a view" of history, and that it seems to have been entertained — at least in varying degrees — by many Hittite authors of historiographic documents. Perhaps the Hattušili III apology is the most extreme case of this outlook, but it is by no means the only composition influenced by this view.

13.3 Although the Apology is the most celebrated historical document from the reign of Hattušili III, it is by no means the only such attempted by this king. Under CTH 82 Laroche groups two large fragments, which he thinks are a part of this king's annals. But of much greater significance are the large fragments which remain of a quite lengthy historical review of the reigns of Šuppiliuma I, Arnuwanda, Muršili II, Muwatalli, Urhitešub and Hattušili III (CTH 83). To this composition may also belong the additional fragments KBo XXII 10, 11 and 36. Significant portions of this composition were first pieced together by K. Riemschneider in JCS

¹¹⁹ Hatt. I 46ff.

16 (1962) 110ff. Most of the subsequent joins and discoveries of duplicates have been duly noted in *CTH* 83. It only remains to indicate that KBo XII 44 seems to supply the lefthand side of column IV of KUB XIX 8. Various factors militate against an indirect join of the two pieces, but they are almost certainly duplicates and with a very similar disposition of the words on the tablet lines. I was also privileged to discover among Prof. Otten's dictionary cards of unpublished fragments in 1972 a small fragment of a duplicate of KUB XIX 9, which carries the number 751/v.

13.4 Because of the as yet incomplete reconstruction of this composition it is perhaps premature to attempt any detailed analysis. But a few remarks are nevertheless appropriate. Since the account stretches back over the reigns of five predecessors, it represents the most ambitious attempt at extended historical review since the Telepinu Proclamation. Hattušili, ignoring the real patron deities of his royal predecessors, attributes their military successes in every case to his own patron goddess, the "Ishtar" of the city of Šamuha. Although the technical term *para handandatar* (on which cf. above in [12.8] and [13.1]) has not yet been identified in the fragments of this composition, the idea is definitely present, and the deity who performs spectacular miracles in the field of battle is Hattušili's goddess, "Ishtar" of Šamuha (cf. KUB XXXI 20+KBo XVI 36+Bo 5768, col. III; *JCS* 16, 110f.). Without the all-important beginning and end of this composition we cannot say to what extent the entire review was motivated by a desire to attribute to Hattušili's patron deity the entire success of the Hittite empire. But it is altogether likely.

13.5 To the reign of the last known Hittite king, Šuppiluliyama (Šuppiluliuma II) belongs that remarkable text discussed above in [1.9]. It is apparently a Hittite translation on a clay tablet of two hieroglyphic inscriptions, which describe the military exploits of the last two Hittite kings, Tudhaliya IV and Šuppiluliyama. Although the narrative material in col. I pertains to Tudhaliya IV and that in col. III to Šuppiluliyama, we are told explicitly that both accounts were drawn up by the latter (ii 11-16), so the style is the same. They are both accounts of campaigns against Cyprus. Whether or not the Tudhaliya statue inscription originally contained "manly deeds" additional to the Alašiya campaign, all that is preserved of this translation or report on KBo XII 38 is the Cyprus events. So both are narrations of single campaigns of the type alluded to in my classification in [18.1] under section II. Although much is lost in the lacunae, so that one must be cautious about arguing from apparently missing features, it should be noted that no example of the stereotyped "divine assistance" clause is preserved. Narration is in the first person. Allocation of the tribute of the conquered land among the temples of the four principal gods of Hatti is absolutely equal (i 13-20).

13.6 From the standpoint of historiography the most significant feature of this poorly preserved text is the claim to factual veracity in reporting, which the king makes in ii 11-16. Preliminary remarks on the meaning of these lines were made by Güterbock¹²⁰. He noted that the *GIM-an* ... *QATAMMA* (qualis ... talis) construction affirms that "I wrote his deeds just as he was". While the general sense must surely be close to this, in detail this formulation is not correct. What the *GIM-an* ... *QATAMMA* clause indicates is that, since Tudhaliya was a "true king" (a genuine, real king), so it was appropriate for his successor in making the statue to honor him with "true (real, not fictitious) exploits". The enormous importance of this kind of thinking by a Hittite author of historical narrative did not escape Cancik, who combined it with other scattered indications from earlier texts¹²¹. Šuppiluliyama's claim not to have omitted information either through oversight or deliberate suppression is only one half of the two-sided standard of accuracy demanded in the legal sphere: one may neither add nor subtract from the true text¹²².

Part C: Previous Studies of Hittite Historiography

14.0 In 1938 H. G. Güterbock published the second part of his dissertation entitled "Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200"¹²³. In the first part he had discussed those Babylonian literary creations which rested upon a historical tradition. The second part concerned Hittite works of a similar type. For the Hittite material he set up two categories: (1) Babylonian literary works taken over into Hittite translations, and (2) native Hittite compositions.

14.1 In the first category belong the Hittite translation of the Sargon "King of Battle" composition, the legendary tale of Naram-Sin (*CTH* 311), and the tale about the hero Gurparanzahu (*CTH* 362). The latter is normally considered to be purely mythological rather than a legendary elaboration of a historical nucleus and thus is found in a different part of La-

¹²⁰ H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 78-79.

¹²¹ *Grundzüge* 118.

¹²² Nicely formulated in Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32. The same idea is conveyed in Hittite legal texts by the use of the verb *wahnu-* "to change, alter (the words of command)", discussed above in [2.7], in footnotes 36-37, and by Neu in *StBoT* 18, 76. A few selected examples may be helpful: "Whoever alters one word of this tablet" KBo IV 10 rev. 26; "If the king gives instructions to any of you, and he (the king's servant) alters the king's word and speaks another word" KUB XXI 42 iv 7f. (from an instructions text); and the interesting description of the ideal, obedient wife, who "doesn't alter her husband's word" but hearkens to it and obeys (KUB XXIV 7 iv 51-53).

¹²³ *ZA* 44 (1938) 45ff.

roche's *CTH* from the Sargon and Naram-Sin materials. One might ask, if Gurparanzahu is included here by virtue of its Babylonian setting, why should not Gilgamesh also belong to the same category? Although the Gilgamesh Epic is clearly the result of much legendary, non-historical overlay, it is acknowledged today that the central character Gilgamesh, king of Uruk, was an historical personage. And in fact the Hittites included in their corpus of Akkadian literary works in translation not only the Sargon and Naram-Sin legends and the Gurparanzahu tale, but also parts of the Gilgamesh Epic (*CTH* 341).

14.2 Recently the corpus of Naram-Sin legend texts from Boğazköy has been significantly enlarged by the publication of fragments from two prisms inscribed at Boğazköy in the cuneiform hand typical of Hattuša (the ductus is old, although perhaps not "typical old"). The texts are written in Akkadian. One prism was six-sided (KBo XIX 98), while the other was four-sided (KBo XIX 99). The smaller fragment (KBo XIX 99) preserves the colophon, which reveals that the scribe, Hanikkuili, was the "son of" (DUMU) Anu-šar-ilāni, who in turn is called "the servant of" a series of gods, including Enbilulu, Ninegal, Anum, Iškur, A.MAL, Aššur, and (the Anatolian deity) Inar. The name Anu-šar-ilāni might indicate that the bearer was a native speaker of Akkadian brought in to Hattuša to train native scribes. On the other hand, a native Hittite, who devoted himself to the study and translation of Akkadian literary works, might have taken a *nom de plume* in the Akkadian language. The expression "son of" (DUMU) could be understood merely as "pupil of", although the Hittites usually employed for this purpose the Sumerogram KAB.ZU.ZU "student, apprentice". The name Hanikkuili was borne by others associated with the scribal craft ¹²⁴.

14.3 Also mentioning Naram-Sin and the city of Agade and perhaps to be added to the texts listed under *CTH* 311 is a small fragment containing parts of ten lines in Hittite (KBo XXII 85). The piece Bo 1309 joined by Otten in ZA 63,86-87 to BoTU 4A, I have seen in Istanbul, and it appears to preserve lines from the obverse not known to Otten.

14.4 Since Güterbock's 1938 study of the Hittite translation of the Sargon legend "King of Battle" further fragments of that composition (*CTH* 310) have come to light at Boğazköy: two smaller pieces (KBo XII 1 and XIII 46) and one larger one (KBo XXII 6), all from the area of the House on the Slope. The right-hand column of the obverse(?) of KBo XIII 46 may be the Hittite translation of a part of the preserved portions

¹²⁴ KBo VI 4 iv colophon.

of the Akkadian version of the King of Battle from El Amarna, but this is not certain¹²⁵. The big piece KBo XXII 6, edited by Güterbock in 1969¹²⁶, adds significantly to the story, since it contains parts not previously known from the Akkadian version.

14.5 Sargon of Akkad's memory was preserved in Hittite written records not only in the translation of the King of Battle text, as Güterbock could know in 1938, but also in mention of him by Hattušili I in the latter's annals (cf. [3.7] and following), as first recognized by Güterbock¹²⁷.

14.6 For the Sargon and Naram-Sin legends we possess parts of the original Akkadian versions. This is not the case, however, for the Gurparanzahu legend. Further fragments of the Hittite translation of the Gurparanzahu legend are KBo XXII 98 and probably KBo XXVI 104.

14.7 The native historical tradition of the Hittites Güterbock subdivided into two categories: (1) products of the "official history writing" ("offizielle Geschichtsschreibung"), and (2) literary creations based upon a tradition which existed alongside the official historiography¹²⁸.

The intention of the 1938 study was to sketch only briefly the official historiography as a background for a more thorough and detailed examination of the second category, which was the Hittite counterpart to the Babylonian compositions which he had examined in part one of the dissertation.

14.8 The principal representatives of category two among the native Hittite compositions were (1) the Zalpa text (*CTH* 3; cf. above in [3.3] and following), (2) the "Cannibal" text KBo III 60 = 2BoTU 21 (*CTH* 17.1; cf. above in [7.2] and following), and (3) the Siege of Uršu text (in Akkadian) (*CTH* 7; cf. above in [4.0] and following). Of these three there have been subsequent textual additions only to the first. The new textual material does not contradict the cautious conclusions drawn by Güterbock in 1938 on the basis of the material then known.

14.9 In connection with the texts which he studied in 1938 Güterbock stressed the use of legendary material in the compositions of his second category and of anecdotal material in his first (the "official historiography").

15.0 Twenty years later, in 1958, Annalies Kammenhuber attempted to survey Hittite historiography on the basis of the enlarged corpus of texts available to her¹²⁹. Her scope was broader than Güterbock's, since she sought to examine (albeit in relatively brief compass) works of both of Güterbock's categories.

¹²⁵ So thinks Meriggi in *Gedenkschrift W. Brandenstein* (Innsbruck 1968) 259ff.

¹²⁶ *MDOG* 101 (1969) 14ff.

¹²⁷ *JCS* 18 (1964) 1ff.

¹²⁸ *ZA* 44 (1938) 101.

¹²⁹ *Saeculum* 9 (1958), 136ff.

15.1 Kammenhuber did not use Güterbock's two-fold division of the texts as her primary guide. Rather she divided Hittite historical texts at the outset chronologically into works from the Old Kingdom and those from the New Kingdom, adding that the differences were sometimes only a matter of degree, since much which was only rudimentary in the Old Kingdom came to full development in the Empire Period.

15.2 Kammenhuber raised certain points which were entirely new, which were not discussed by Güterbock in 1938. In her consideration of the annals genre she advanced the theory that Muršili II was the first Hittite king to compose annals. This theory she defended in an addendum even after the discovery of the Hattušili I annals¹³⁰, although she has since abandoned it. Other scholars would agree that Muršili II devoted more attention to this text type and made important stylistic adaptations (cf. [12.1] and following). But he was surely not the first Hittite king to write annals. I do not find Kammenhuber's "chronicle literature" category very meaningful or useful in the sorting out of significant formal differences among historical writings of the Old Kingdom. A "chronicle" is "a continuous register of events in order of time" (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*), or "a bare or simple chronological record of events" (Webster). By these definitions one can certainly not classify the so-called "Palace Chronicle" as a chronicle. It shows little concern with arranging events strictly according to the temporal sequence. Even the Telepinu Proclamation's long historical prologue better deserves the name "chronicle" than do the texts and fragments which Kammenhuber subsumes under this rubric. A concern for temporal sequence in narration is observed in the Anitta text, the Zalpa tale, the Annals of Hattušili, the fragments of the text describing Muršili I's campaigns against Aleppo and Babylon, and the Telepinu Proclamation. Some fragments are too small to allow speculation as to the observance of chronological sequence in the complete work: Ammuna text, Cannibal text, Telepinu against Lahha, and Zukraši.

15.3 In connection with her discussion of the Telepinu Proclamation she argues that Telepinu made use of pre-existing written sources, which she calls "eine althethitische Chronikliteratur". It would certainly appear that Telepinu employed written sources, where such existed. But to call these a "Chronikliteratur" seems to me to restrict his sources beyond what is required by our present evidence. Kammenhuber explains¹³¹ that by a "Chronikliteratur" she means texts which present events in a relatively objective manner without admixture of mythological

¹³⁰ Page 154, note 101.

¹³¹ Page 143.

material. She excludes from this category also those texts which (like the "Palace Chronicle") employ anecdotes in a moralizing fashion. Thus she seems to set up at least three categories of Old Hittite historiographic literature: (1) the literary works with mythologizing (Güterbock's second category), (2) the anecdotal, moralizing texts, and (3) the "Chronikliteratur". This classification underdifferentiates the texts in her third category. Certainly those texts which she explicitly ascribes to the "Chronikliteratur" in her footnote 37 are underdifferentiated formally. Some such as the Ammuna text (*CTH* 18) — and the Manly Deeds of Hattušili I, which was unknown to her at the time she wrote the body of the article — are first person narratives and clearly of the annalistic type (cf. [3.11] and following and [8.2]). But other texts of her category, such as the texts about Muršili I (*CTH* 10 and 11) are clearly not of this type at all.

15.4 I further question her opinion that historiography in the strict sense of the word begins only in the New Kingdom. Documents such as the Apology of Hattušili III (cf. [13.1]) are no more worthy of the name "historiography in the strict sense" than the Telepinu Proclamation. Both are works of sheer propaganda. On the other hand annalistic texts with less obvious bias such as the Annals of Muršili II have clear Old Kingdom counterparts (Annals of Hattušili I, Ammuna annals). Her criticism of the Sumerian and Babylonian historiographers — that they "had no sense of history as such", that history interested them only insofar as it provided a basis for an ethical doctrine of reward for virtue and punishment for evil¹³³ — applies equally well to the best of Hittite historiographic works. The Telepinu Proclamation and the prologues to the state treaties were not the result of disinterested inquiry by Hittite kings into the causes of a present situation; they were rather the product of a chancellory intent on giving a decidedly pro-Hittite, highly selective pre-history, calculated to reinforce present policy. Such literary efforts did not create new policy, they defended a pre-formulated existing policy. It seems to me, therefore, gratuitous to speak of a praiseworthy "historischer Sinn" of the Hittites, which was clearly superior to the concepts of the neighboring contemporary peoples and which one must attribute to the symbiosis between Hattians and Indo-European Hittites.

15.5 Neither Güterbock in 1938 nor Kammenhuber in 1958 had access to all the texts which are available today. One cannot predict where they would have fitted into their schemata the newly discovered texts. One assumes that in 1938 Güterbock included under the official historiography all historical texts and fragments of such which he did not explicitly assign to the literary creations category, and the latter he limited to four: (1) the

¹³³ Page 146.

Zalpa story, (2) the Cannibal story, (3) BoTU 14, and (4) the Siege of Uršu. Aside from the additions to the Zalpa story, which certainly confirm his attribution of it to the literary creations, the only important totally unknown texts to appear have been the Manly Deeds of Hattušili I and the Zukraši text. These one would assume he would have included under official historiography.

16.0 In two monographs published in 1970¹³³ and 1976¹³⁴ Hubert Cancik greatly clarified the subject of Hittite historiography in the area of its techniques. Although his two studies have made contributions in many areas of the subject, I would judge his finest contribution to be the detailed analysis of the historiography of the Muršili II annals (cf. above in [12.1-2]). Although his works came to my attention too late to be used in the basic manuscript, which was prepared for oral presentation in Toronto in autumn, 1976, I have tried to integrate his ideas as fully as possible in subsequent drafts.

16.1 A short contribution by A. Archi, which appeared in 1969, has not escaped my notice¹³⁵. Its contributions are more modest, and it is devoted more to the Old Hittite period, which was already so well treated by Güterbock.

Part D: Conclusions about Hittite Historiography

17.0 A primary question is the Hittites' own literary categories, as they affect the texts which we have been calling "historical". Such terminology occurs either on the colophons of the tablets themselves, or on the bibliographic entries of the Hittites' archive shelf lists (what E. Laroche treats as "débris de fichier" in *CTH*, pp. 153ff.). What name did they give to compositions which we call "decrees", "annals", "apologies" or "chronicles"?

17.1 The documentation of the two types just mentioned is unfortunately incomplete. Colophons are broken away for several of the most important examples of compositions in the historiographic category. The shelf lists treated by Laroche cover partially the contents of several rooms in buildings A, C, E, G, H and K, all of which are on the acropolis (Büyük-kale). We have virtually no shelf lists known to derive from the House on the Slope or the Great Temple, the two sites from which derive most of the historical texts whose find spots we know. From the Great Temple comes only the fragment KBo XIX 35, which mentions three treaties.

¹³³ H. Cancik, *Mythische und historische Wahrheit* (Stuttgart).

¹³⁴ H. Cancik, *Grundzüge der hethitischen und alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden).

¹³⁵ A. Archi, "La storiografia ittita", *Athenaeum* NS 47, 7-20.

The only historical texts mentioned in existing shelf lists from the acropolis are a very few treaties (cf. *CTH*, p. 163).

17.2 Treaties were known by various terms. During the Old Kingdom they were called "tablets of *takšul*", while in the New Kingdom they were known as "tablets of *išhiul*" ¹³⁶. The former term stresses the aspect of peaceful concurrence, the latter the imposition of an obligation. They could also be referred to as "tablets of the oath".

17.3 The Political Testament of Hattušili I (*CTH* 6) has a preserved colophon. In the colophon no single technical term is employed to describe the composition, but the Akkadian verb *wu"uru* there describes what the king does to his son Muršili in this text ¹³⁷. *wu"uru* should probably be translated "to give commands, instructions, orders" here (cf. *CAD* A, 320ff. sub 3). Thus what we call the Political Testament, stressing the bequeathing of power, the Hittite scribe conceived as an Old Kingdom prototype to the so-called "Instructions Texts" from the New Kingdom period. Only in this case the recipient is not a civil servant, but the newly appointed heir, the crown prince.

17.4 The Telepinu Proclamation, which as we saw has the form of an edict or decree, is called in its colophon only "tablet one of Telepinu; finished" ¹³⁸.

17.5 There is no colophon for the Anitta text (*CTH* 1), and none preserved for the Zalpa Text (*CTH* 3), the siege of Uršu (*CTH* 7), the Palace Chronicle (*CTH* 8), the Ammuna annals (*CTH* 18), or the texts dealing with Muršili I's and Hanteli I's activities (*CTH* 10-13).

17.6 All annals texts for which colophons are preserved use the technical term *LÚ-natar* (= *pišnatar*) "manhood, manly deed, exploit" ¹³⁹. The connection of this word both with the sexual capacity of a man and his military prowess I have discussed elsewhere ¹⁴⁰. The nexus is important for the use of certain masculine and feminine symbols in the magic rituals. The term *LÚ-natar* "exploit, manly deed" is found not only in the colophons as a title for the genre annals, but in the body of military narratives. In his Apology Hattušili III wrote: "this was my first manly deed; my lady Ishtar on this campaign for the first time called my name" (*Hatt.* II 29-30).

¹³⁶ H. Otten, *JCS* 5 (1951) 129ff.

¹³⁷ F. Sommer & A. Falkenstein, *HAB* 16-17, 200.

¹³⁸ BoTU 23A iv 27-28.

¹³⁹ KBo X 2 iv colophon 1'-2'; KBo II 5 iv colophon (= *AM* 192f.); KUB XXVI 27:17, 19. *pišnataršet* in KUB XX 54 + KBo XIII 122: 7 corresponds in the parallel KBo XXI 22 obv. 26' to *LÚ-taršetwa*.

¹⁴⁰ H. A. Hoffner, *JBL* 85 (1966) 327 with note 4.

17.7 There is unfortunately no colophon to the great Apology of Hattušili III, so that we cannot learn from that what term was applied to it by the scribes.

17.8 Because the find spots of the vast majority of historical texts are presently unknown, it is risky to generalize from those which we know. We saw earlier (cf. [17.1]) that of the historical texts from the Old Kingdom period, most whose find spots are known came from the House on the Slope and the Great Temple. But the Manly Deeds of Hattušili I came from Building K on the Acropolis (cf. [1.10]). So perhaps nothing significant can be learned from the find spots as to which texts the Hittites themselves considered "historical" or even "literary".

17.9 An interesting question is who constituted the intended audience for the historical texts?¹⁴¹

None of the texts is monumental. None was written on a stela for the general public to read. Anitta's text, we are told in his own words, was originally placed in his gateway¹⁴². But what we have in Hittite is probably not that original inscription, and it was certainly not displayed. If Güterbock's theory¹⁴³ is correct that the Nišantaš hieroglyphic inscription is to be found in translation or paraphrase in KBo XII 38 (CTH 121), this would be evidence for a monumental usage of a historical narrative. One wonders also just what kind of a monument was erected by Hattušili III to celebrate his victories, which twice in his Apology he refers to with the words: *šU-an ... wedaḥḥun* (II 25, 44) "I erected/built a 'hand'". Could this victory monument have been inscribed?

17.10 But aside from these somewhat dubious cases it would appear that no Hittite historical text as we have it was intended for a public display. If the text itself was not be visually displayed, there is still the possibility that it was to be read aloud in public. We know, for instance, that the state treaties with vassals were to be read aloud. To be sure the audience was not crowds of ordinary citizens assembled in the street, but rather a select group of nobles assembled in court. The Political Testament and the Telepinu Proclamation were addressed to the king's court, the body of nobles who served him in high capacities.

17.11 The annals texts are another matter. No evidence suggests that they were to be read aloud before the assembled court. Nothing in the wording of the texts — no second person pronouns consistently applied throughout the texts — indicates the addressees. One can only make an educated guess based upon the overall content and possible pur-

¹⁴¹ H. Cancik, *Grundzüge* 54.

¹⁴² KBo III 22 + obv. 33f.

¹⁴³ *JNES* 26 (1967) 73ff.

poses of the texts. The Ten-Year Annals of Muršili, as we saw (cf. [12.1]), are a record of how in a delimited period of time the young king — empowered by the sun goddess — defeated his enemies who belittled him and thus proved himself a man and a king. The opening and closing paragraphs of the composition suggest that the documentary record itself may have been made as part of the king's discharge of indebtedness to the sun goddess¹⁴⁴. It is not too much to assume that the sun goddess herself was the primary intended audience. This is not to say that all Hittite annals were a account rendered to the gods. There is no similar indication for the Annals of Hattušili I or for the other annalistic compositions. Most of the tablets and tablet fragments of Muršili II annals whose find spots are known come from the Acropolis (Building A), but at least one (KBo XVI 5+KUB XIX 40) from the east magazine of the Great Temple. At least that copy of Muršili annals could have been "placed before the deity". We have seen that the annals seek to present the most flattering picture possible of the king. Whom was the author trying to impress?

17.12 In [1.5] we raised the question: Which royal activities were chosen for commemoration in the historical texts? Answers have been suggested for each text, as it was discussed in turn in [3.12f.], [4.1f.], [5.1], [6.2], [12.1] and [12.4-5]. Some final observations on the subject are now in order. Hittite kings did not devote much space in their inscriptions to describing their building activities. Goetze¹⁴⁵ noted that we lack Hittite building inscriptions and that we possess only one textual reference to a royal hunt. One may wish to discount Anitta's references to building activities¹⁴⁶, because he did not reign in Hattuša and may not have been a "Hittite" in the narrow sense, although his inscription is written in the Hittite language. But happily there is other evidence. Muršili I's successor, Hanteli I, recorded his building of fortification walls in Hattuša¹⁴⁷. Šuppiluliuma I and Muršili II reported fortifying cities and lands¹⁴⁸. And Hattušili III commemorated in his inscriptions the building of temples and cities. In his Apology he twice mentioned the erection of victory stelae, which he designated with the sign šu "hand". In another place he described the preparation of a "bone(?) house" (Hittite *haštiyaš per*)¹⁴⁹.

¹⁴⁴ Especially KBo III 4 iv 48, on which see A. Götze, *AM* 137, note a.

¹⁴⁵ A. Goetze, *Kleinasien* (1957) 92; R. Hardy, *AJSL* 58 (1941) 184.

¹⁴⁶ Anitta Text, §§ 14 and 15; see E. Neu, *StBoT* 18 (1974), 12-15, lines 55ff.

¹⁴⁷ BoTU 20 (= KBo III 57) iii 12ff.

¹⁴⁸ H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956) 90, fragment 28, A i 1-17, 31ff.; A. Goetze, *AM* 92f., 99f., 105f., 120f., etc.

¹⁴⁹ Apology of Hattušili, II 25 and 44, on which see C. H. Gordon, *Before the Bible*, 93, H. M. Wolf, *The Apology of Hattušiliš Compared...* (Ann Arbor

Yet, although building activities form a part of the many royal achievements worthy of mention, no separate part of the text was assigned to building activities, as was true in Mesopotamian texts. The building activities were simply noted in the course of the historical narrative.

17.13 Later Assyrian kings liked to portray themselves on hunts or at banquets. In his classic study of Hittite civilization the late Albrecht Goetze observed that, whereas the pre-Old Kingdom monarch Anitta likewise described a hunt in which he took part, later Hittite kings eschewed the mention of royal hunts, if indeed they ever participated in such. Anitta not only lists the animals caught on the hunt, but informs us that before departing on the hunt he made a vow to a deity: "I made a vow (to the deity) and [on] a hu[nt I went]" ¹⁵⁰. Since the vow immediately preceded the hunt, I would suspect that he vowed that, if he found success on the hunt, he would dedicate all or a portion of the catch to the deities' temples. But Goetze is right: Anitta's successors never mention royal hunts. Neither are banquets reported in texts or depicted in the art of the Old and New Kingdoms (c. 1700-1200 B.C.). By contrast and perhaps owing to the Syro-Assyrian influence the so-called Neo-Hittite kings of 1200-800 B.C. often described building activities in hieroglyphic inscriptions and were fond of hunting and banquet scenes in their monumental art.

17.14 Articles have been written about the sense of causality in Hittite historiography ¹⁵¹. It is true that in some compositions such as the plague prayers of Muršili II the causes for catastrophes were sought in events of the past. But these are not direct causes. They do not function on the purely horizontal level. An ancestor's sin does not bring about a plague except insofar as it infuriates a deity. Thus the Hittites viewed history in much the same way as their ancient neighbors: the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Egyptians, and the West Semites. They saw their gods as intervening in the course of human affairs in such a way that the actions of men which pleased or displeased these gods inevitably influenced the subsequent course of history. The records of the past could afford

1967) 52 and 189 with note 139, and H. A. Hoffner, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968) 222 with note 6. For the *ḫaštiyaš* per see Apology of Hattušili, IV 75f.

¹⁵⁰ Anitta text, line 59, which should *nu maltahhun nu huwar[nuwanzi paun]*, instead of *huwar[tahhun]* read by E. Neu, *StBoT* 18 (1974) 14f., 44, 87. This sentence is separated from the preceding narrative of building activity by a paragraph line. It is immediately followed by the account of a royal hunt, in which animals were captured alive and brought back to the capital city, where they were placed in a zoological garden, probably in fulfilment of the oath to the deity (*maltahhun*).

¹⁵¹ A. Malamat, *VT* 5 (1955) 1-12.

to subsequent generations certain lessons (hence, the anecdotes in the Old Kingdom texts), but these lessons were of a very simple kind. No historian king, writing of the past, ever expressed himself thus: "The reason why Hanteli was unable to succeed politically was because his propaganda was inferior and his overall strategy was wrong". Rather such a king's error was in murder and intrigue within the royal family, matters more ethical or religious than practical and secular. We should not look for the attitude or methods of a Thucydides in ancient Hittite historiographers. The world was not ready for that kind of *ιστορία* yet and would not be for many centuries.

17.15 Bearing upon the native conceptions of history is the question of divine involvement in past, present, and future events. The Hittites were kept from a free, and totally horizontal, world view of causation by their religious conceptions. The gods intervened to influence directly the course of human events. In the most sober and non-mythological of annalistic texts, those of Muršili II, the storm god intervenes in the struggle against Uhhaziti of Arzawa by hurling a thunderbolt and striking the enemy king to his knees¹⁵³. Muršili appeals to the storm god as arbiter of international law to decide the suit in his favor by letting him win the battle¹⁵³. Even more crassly folklorish is the description of the god Hašameli making Muršili and his men invisible so that undetected by the enemy they may carry out tactical manoeuvres¹⁵⁴. This is surely divine intervention and causation. One need only mention the Apology of Hattušili with its flat statement that "in every instance" the goddess Shaushka took the king by the hand and rescued him. Admittedly such striking cases of divine intervention in historical narrative are not equally frequent in all historiographic compositions; they are totally lacking from the Telepinu Proclamation, the Palace Chronicles, Siege of Uršu, etc. There "the gods" in the anonymous plural form show pleasure in good kings and displeasure with usurpers and assassins, who have shed royal blood¹⁵⁵. Yet even if less pronounced, the same basic view is present.

17.16 Equally relevant is the question of predetermination of events, as we might say, by "fate". The Hittites believed in fate deities who attended births of gods and kings (at least) and decreed fates¹⁵⁶. One doesn't know how detailed these fates were. They may have been no

¹⁵³ KBo III 4 ii 15ff. (*AM* 46f.) = Ten-Year Annals § 17.

¹⁵³ See above in footnote 104.

¹⁵⁴ KBo IV 4 iii 33f. (*AM* 126ff.), KUB XIX 37 iii 16f. (*AM* 173-4); A. Goetze, *Language* 29 (1953) 269f.

¹⁵⁵ Telepinu Proclamation (BoTU 23A) i 42f., 66ff. See further discussion in [9.3].

¹⁵⁶ See H. A. Hoffner, *JNES* 27 (1968) 198ff.

more specific than "long years and success". Once in a mythological text an eagle reports that these deities were spinning the years of the king and queen like yarn¹⁵⁷. In another mythological text the destiny of the monster Ullikummi is to defeat the storm god Teshub and smash the latter's town Kummiya, which he later does, although he is finally defeated¹⁵⁸. In the tale of Appu the father himself gives predetermination of the characters of his two sons by the names he bestows: "bad" and "good"¹⁵⁹. Certainly the thinking of the Hittites was conditioned by certain ideas of predetermination of events.

Predictions were not only related in mythological texts; one can find them in historical texts too. In the Apology of Hattušili III the goddess "Ishtar" (Shaushka) promised future kingship on many occasions to Hattušili, often doing so through his wife Puduhepa's dreams. "Because formerly Ishtar my lady kept promising me kingship, at that time Ishtar my lady appeared to my wife in a dream, saying: '... Now I will take him up and install him as priest of the sun goddess of Arinna (= emperor)' " (col. IV, 7ff.). "My lady Ishtar supported me. And according as she had been promising me, just so it also came to pass" (col. IV, 16-17). But despite the clear examples of divine predictions, in which gods reveal their intended actions (and therefore the future) to men through dreams, divination, and occasionally inspired men¹⁶⁰, we possess in Hittite literature no examples of "prophecy texts", such as are found in Mesopotamia.

17.17 It is known that in ancient Mesopotamia the stream of events in time which we call "history" was conceived neither as a single line leading to a goal (eschatological) nor as a series of recurring cycles¹⁶¹. No one has ever written on this question with regard to Hittite texts. There is very little Hittite evidence to use in this subject. One fascinating passage at the end of a ritual text, however, deserves to be quoted as possible evidence for a kind of eschatology among the Hittites. The text describes how at the end of the ceremony certain ingredients of the magical rites are poured into a cow's horn, and the two persons on whose behalf the ritual was performed seal it over on top. Then the practitioner, who was an old woman, says: "When the former kings shall return and look after the law of the land, then only may this seal be broken!"¹⁶². I seriously doubt that the speaker was speaking frivolously and only had in

¹⁵⁷ KUB XXIX 1 ii 8ff. (ANET 357).

¹⁵⁸ See note 156 above.

¹⁵⁹ See note 156 above.

¹⁶⁰ A. Goetze, *Kleinasien* (1957) 147ff.

¹⁶¹ See A. K. Grayson, *Or* 49 (1980) 191.

¹⁶² KBo II 3 iv 10-13; English translation in ANET 351; see discussion by H. G. Güterbock in *Symbolae Koschaker* 26ff.

mind the thought "since these kings will never come back, the seal will never be broken". Rather this passage attests a belief — how widespread we cannot say — that at some indefinite future time the kings of the past would return to earth to restore law, order, and prosperity.

17.18 Was there any body of historical records kept by the scribes which related the events of history in chronological order in a detached manner without flattery and rhetoric? Kammenhuber sought such texts among the Old Kingdom compositions such as *CTH* 10-18. We have maintained that at least *CTH* 11A and 13A are first person narratives of an annalistic type. Where some of these texts contain third person narrative, they may actually be relating the events of the author-king's predecessors, about whom he feels no need to boast¹⁶³. They can hardly serve as evidence for objective historical memoranda. Although such memoranda might have been kept on perishable materials such as the wax-covered wood tablets mentioned in Hittite cuneiform sources, no documentary evidence indicates that the Hittite "wood scribes" copied historical texts or kept data relating to military campaigns, etc.¹⁶⁴.

17.19 In his analysis of ancient Mesopotamian historiography A. K. Grayson¹⁶⁵ attributes to them six motives for investigating and writing about the past: (1) to create propaganda, (2) didactic use, (3) chauvinism or national pride, (4) calendrical or chronological aids, (5) use for omen apodoses, and (6) to foster the cult of the dead kings. The question naturally arises: Were any of these motives operative for Hittites who investigated their pasts? Some clearly were.

Certainly there is no evidence that the Hittites conserved data for calendrical or chronological purposes. The total absence of date lists, king lists, eponym lists and the like, amply attests this disinterest in matters chronological. Nor does any Hittite text ever date an event in "the *n*th year of king so-and-so". All omen collections at Hattuša are copies or translations of Mesopotamian originals, and we have no evidence that they ever composed new ones. That offerings were made to dead kings (hence "cult") we know from the offering lists with names of kings, queens and members of the royal family¹⁶⁶. That the annals of dead kings may

¹⁶³ If KBo III 57 (BoTU 20) is not a *Sammeltafel*, then the end, which is a first person Hanteli text indicates that the earlier columns (third person report of Hattušili I and Muršili I activities) may have been Hanteli's review of the deeds of his predecessors.

¹⁶⁴ See my note 11 and [1.7-8] above.

¹⁶⁵ *Or* 49, 189-191.

¹⁶⁶ *CTH* 661; cf. H. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951) 47ff.; A. Goetze, *JAOS* 72 (1952) 67ff.; *JCS* 11 (1957) 53ff.; H. Otten, *Abhandlungen der Akad. Wiss. Lit. Mainz*, Jahrg. 1968, Nr. 3, p. 125.

have been used in this cult would be a supposition not yet proven, but certainly not improbable. In fact, thanks to Güterbock's interpretation of KBo XII 38, we know that Šuppiluliuma II made a statue of his deceased predecessor Tudhaliya IV for his mortuary temple and inscribed on it the account of the dead king's conquest of Cyprus. If this practice had roots in the past, or better, yet hitherto undiscovered precedents, it would document exactly this Mesopotamian motive to foster the cult of the dead kings.

17.20 It is clear that many historical works (among them the Telepinu Proclamation and the Apology of Hattušili III) were primarily works of royal propaganda. This does not utterly preclude their use in reconstructing the actual course of events, but it was clearly their chief intent and should guide the modern scholar in avoiding an improper and uncritical use of their evidence. Cultic propaganda such as one finds in Mesopotamia and Israel and Egypt is not so easy to identify. It goes without saying that royal propaganda also benefited the cults of the deities who were the king's patrons, in Muršili II's case the sun goddess of Arinna, in Hattušili III's the Shaushka of Šamuha. But such indirect benefits do not qualify these works in the same way that a direct and primary purpose for a composition made by the priesthood of a certain deity would.

17.21 A didactic use of a work of historiography can also be demonstrated for the Palace Chronicle (cf. [6.1-3]) with its long sequence of anecdotes about civil servants, their mistakes and failures, and their punishment by the king. Other examples would certainly be found in the Political Testament of Hattušili I (cf. [5.0 f.]) and the story of the Siege of Uršu (cf. [4.3]). Admonitory anecdotes are also found in treaties (Hukkana) and instructions texts (Zuliya in *CTH* 265); cf. [1.4]. Didactic in its stress on the need for unity in the royal family is the Telepinu Proclamation (cf. [9.0 ff.]).

17.22 I am much less sure that I can identify works of Hittite historiography composed in order to appeal to "national pride". My first reaction was to include that motivation along with Grayson's (4) and (5) as absent from Hittite historiography. On further reflection it occurred to me that even royal annals could be directed to the national pride. In fact a few examples of military narrative from the Hittite Old Kingdom contain long sections composed in "we" verb forms¹⁶⁷. But I would judge that the Hittites had nothing remotely approaching the Homeric Iliad in its role as the buttress of national Greek pride and unifier of the various Greek sub-groups.

¹⁶⁷ See above in [7.2] with bibliography.

18.0 Although I do not claim the following classification of Hittite historical texts to be definitive, I offer it for consideration. Different classifications have been offered by Güterbock (1938) and Kammenhuber (1958), which were considered above (cf. [14.0 ff.] and [15.1-4]).

18.1 I. Narratives of military campaigns with prominent division into years and with standard stylistic format (itinerary, naming of cities, stereotyped capsule descriptions of battles, listing of booty and captives). Cf. [3.4 ff.] and [12.0 ff.]. Most are phrased in first person, as though told by the king himself. Some are told by his son (Deeds of Šuppiluliuma), but still by a reigning king.

II. Narratives of one or more military operations within a single year (not therefore comprising a complete record of a single campaign). The existing examples (Siege of Uršu, "Cannibal text", aspects of Political Test. Hatt. I) happen also to exhibit extensive legendary-mythological elaboration.

III. Court histories describing activities of persons in governmental or administrative capacities or members of the immediate royal family. The activities so described are customarily misbehavior for which the perpetrators are removed from office. Examples: Political Testament of Hattušili I, "Palace Chronicle".

IV. Texts describing course of events over a lengthy period leading up to the accession of a usurper. To be called "accession narratives" or more specifically "political apologies"¹⁸⁸. Both examples (Telepinu Proclamation, Apology of Hattušili III) assume the outward form of edicts, with prefaced historical narrative. Narrative sections of the two share the same basic organization:

- 1) the worthy remote ancestors — the golden age past,
- 2) the unworthy immediate predecessor(s) — intrusive chaos,
- 3) the usurper as restorer of order and renewer of golden age.

V. Sections of historical narrative in compositions whose content is not primarily historical narrative:

- 1) In treaty or edict prologues: examples are to be found in virtually all state treaties and in most known edicts (e.g., Mittannamuwa),
- 2) In royal prayers: Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (Kaška incursions), Muršili plague prayers, Hattušili and Puduhepa prayers.

The Oriental Institute
1155 East 58th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

¹⁸⁸ Cf. H. A. Hoffner, in Goedicke & Roberts (eds.), *Unity and Diversity* 49ff.